INDIAN

VOL. 6

1895

C.K.V.
LIB
HARIDWAR

028219

078219

Stock Verification 2023-25

INDIA.

Acc No: RT-0369

GURUKULA LIBRARY
44 J
1-2-08

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1895.

VOL. VI. NEW SERIES.

London:
PUBLISHED BY THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

1895.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY A. BONNER,
1 & 2 TOOK'S COURT, E.C.

INDEX.

A.

"A Fighter Ever," 169.
Acton on the Study of History, Lord, 329.
Acquisition of Territory since 1880, 322.
Acworth, H. O., *Ballads of the Marathas*, 31.
Administration, of Civil and Criminal Justice in India, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A., 49; of the Survey Department, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A., 247; Superfluous Offices in the Administration of India, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A., 281; Indian Administration: A Retrospect, by J. Dacosta, 244.
Adye, General Sir J., on the Indian "Forward" Frontier Policy, 156.
Afghanistan, The New Invasion of, by An Anglo-Indian, 19.
Aggression, The Cost of, 317.
Agricultural Banks Association, 15.
An Experiment and After, 8.
Anglo-Indians and the Congress, 171.
Apportionment of Charge, The, 367.
Arbitrary Power, in the Administration of India, The Exercise of, by J. Dacosta, 82; and Financial Administration, by J. Dacosta, 119.

B.

Bhattacharya, M.A., Babu, M. L., *The Vedanta Philosophy*, 287.
Banks Association, Agricultural, 15.
Balfour on Chitral, Mr., 366.
Baroda Kala Bavan, The, 37
Bengal, Sir C. Elliott's Administration in, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A., 337.
Bhownaggree, M. M., M.P., Dinner to, 355, 379.
Bhica Behrane Charity, The, 3.
Bhousla Fund, The, 201.
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects, 32, 48, 80, 128, 144, 176, 224, 240, 288, 319, 332, 383.
Bill, The Indian Immigration Law Amendment, 294; Pilgrim Ships, 294; Police Amendment, 70; The Jury, 336, 354.
Bimetallism, Mr. Balfour and, 37; *Bimetallism and India*, 382.
"Bleeding" of British India, 35.
Bombay Provincial Council, 344.
Bonnerjee, W. C., on British Rule in India, 203.
Bose, Pramatha Nath, B.Sc., F.G.S., M.R.A.S., *History of Hindu Civilisation during British Rule*, 123.
Brassey on India, Lord, 47; Lord Brassey and others, 167.
British Constituencies and India: Meeting in Manchester, 185.
British Indians in South Africa, 196, 292, 301, 324, 366.
Buddha and His Religion, The, 348.
Budget, The Indian, 164, 289, 290; The Indian Parliamentary Committee and the Indian, 215; Notes on the Indian Budget, by A. J. Wilson, 77; Sir J. Westland's, 198; Lord George Hamilton's Speech on the Indian, by H. Morgan-Browne, LL.B., 313; Military Aggression and the Indian, 135.
Bureaucracy, P. M. Mehta on Anglo-Indian, 70.

C.

Candidates for Parliament. Indian, 250.
Cantonments Question, The, by Prof. J. Stuart, M.P., 23.
Carus, Paul, *The Gospel of Buddha according to Old Records*, 125.
Chamberlain, Deputation to Mr., 301, 366.
Chamberlain, General Sir N. on the "Forward" Frontier Policy, 154.
Chelmsford, General Lord on the "Forward" Frontier Policy, 155.
Chesney, Sir George, Death of, 132.
"Chips," More, 40; "*Chips Linguistic and Literary*. 191.
Chitral. Forward Policy in, 129, 216; Future Policy in, 161, 193, 270; Opinions of the Press on, 194; in the Commons, 295; Occupation of, 289, 291; Conservative Policy in, 227, 257, 323; Retention of, 305, 307, 310; Honours and Decorations, 227, 237; Chitral: an Object Lesson, 133; Relieved, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., 145; The Anglo-Russian Agreement and, 149; The Dark Shadow Behind, 150; Chitral and Kabul, by J. Dacosta, 211; Chitral in 1895, by J. Dacosta, 276; Lord Rosebery on Chitral, by An Anglo-Indian, 278; Mr. Balfour on Chitral, 366; Lord Lansdowne on Chitral, 377.
Christians and the Congress, Indian, by A. Nundy, 372.
Civil Service, Entrance to the, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 340; Examination Results, 291; Commissioners, Report of the, 325.
Colvin, John Russell, by Sir A. Colvin, K.C.S.I., K.C.M.G., C.I.E., 79.
Colvin's Reply to Mr. Fowler's Optimism, Sir Auckland, 77; Article on Frontier and Finance, 357.
Commission, on Indian Expenditure, The Royal, 130, 166, 176, 194, 208, 353; Memorandum by the British Committee, 284; Exclusion of the Public, 226; The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, by H. N. Haridas, 179; Home Charges and the Royal, by T. Lloyd, 180; Scope of the Royal, by H. N. Haridas, 342; Report of the Opium, 164; Questions Submitted to the Opium, 165; Anglo-Indian and the Opium, 188; Cost of the Opium, 101.
Commissioners' Programme, The, 326.
Compensation Allowance, Exchange, 291.
Conference, Seventh Provincial, 26; Eighth Provincial, 268.
Congress, The Tenth (verse), 14: Presidents' Address, 57: Summary of Resolutions passed at the, 60; British Committee of the, 72; *The Times* and the 1; Criticisms of Anglo-Indian Journals 34; Luncheon to Mr. Webb, M.P., at the National Liberal Club, 84; Opinions of the Press, 90; Dinner to the President, 175; Sir R. Garth's Defence of the Indian National Congress, 97, 121; Anglo-Indians and the, 171; Report of the British Committee, 332; The Eleventh Congress, 353; The Coming Congress, 371; Indian Christians and the Congress, 372.
Cost of Aggression, The, 317; of the Shahzada's Visit, 196, 351.
Cotton Goods and Import Duties: Opinions of the Press, 281; Debate on the Cotton Duties, 106; by Herbert W. Paul, M.P., 113; Import Duties on, 36, 65, 98; Lancashire and the, 323.
Council, Bombay Provincial, 344; Appointments to the India, 101.

D.

Dacosta, J., on the Exercise of Arbitrary Power in the Administration of India, 82; Arbitrary Power and Financial Administration, 119; Lord Roberts and Indian Frontier Defence, 147; Chitral and Kabul, 211; Indian Administration: A Retrospect, 244; Chitral in 1895, 276; A Retrospect and a Moral, 307; Observance of the Law in India, 343; The External Policy of the Government of India, 374.
Democracy and Imperialism, by A. E. Fletcher, 209.
Dilke, Sir C., on Indian Finance, 142.

E.

East India Association, Proceedings of the, 197.
Education in India, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 241.
Effects of English Law Courts on Indian Society, Disintegrating, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A., 24.
Election, India and the General, 230; The General Election, by Herbert W. Paul, 273.
Elliott's, Sir C., Administration in Bengal, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A., 337; and the Jury Bill, 354.
Empire of India Exhibition, 205, 254.
Entrance to the Civil Service, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 340.
Exchange Compensation Allowance, 291.
Executive in India, The Judiciary and the, 360.
Expenditure, The Royal Commission on Indian, 130, 166, 176, 194, 208; Exclusion of the Public, 226; by H. N. Haridas, 226.
Expert on the Forward Policy, An, 156.
External Policy of the Government of India, The, by J. Dacosta, 374.
"*Ex Uno Disce Omnes*," by A. Webb, M.P., 281.

F.

Finance, Some Aspects of Indian, by T. Lloyd, 140; Sir C. Dilke on Indian, 142; Mr. Fowler on Indian, 66 (see also "Budget," "Chitral," "'Forward' Frontier Policy," etc.).
Financial Difficulties of India, 14; Financial Administration, Arbitrary Power and, by J. Dacosta, 119; The Financial Danger, 264.
Fletcher, A. E., on Democracy and Imperialism, 209.
"Forward" Frontier Policy, 145, 147, 149, 150, 152; Opinions of Some Experts on, 154; Some Press Opinions on the, 158; Chitral and the, 129, 216; What the "Forward" Policy Means," 377, 380.
Fowler, Mr., at the India Office, 200.
Fowler's, Mr., Opportunity, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 17; Optimism: Sir Auckland Colvin's Reply, 77; Fowler's, Sir H., Speech, by An Anglo-Indian, 310.
Friends in India, To, by A. O. Hume, 369.
Frontier, Our Scientific, 358.
Fund, The Bhousla, 201.

G.

Garth, Sir R., on the Congress: Crushing Reply to Sir G. Chesney, 121.
General Election, India and the, 230; by Herbert W. Paul, 273.
Ghose, "Interview" with Mr. Monomohan, 360.
Girls, Schools for Married Indian, 207.
Gondal State, Administration of the, 260, 292.
Gospel of Buddha, The, 125.
Gough, General Sir C. J. S., on the "Forward" Frontier Policy, 155.
Gratitude of Indians, 166.
Griffin's, Sir L., Guesses on the Indian Problem, by "A Tartar," 114; by Jnanen N. Ray, 117.

H.

Hamilton, Lord G., and Lancashire, 296; Appointment of, 226; Budget Speech of, by H. Morgan-Browne, LL.B., 313.
Haridas, H. N., on the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, 179; Scope of the Royal Commission, 342.
Harris, Memorial to Lord, 1, 37.
Hart, E., D.C.L., *The Nurseries of Cholera*, 127.
Hastings, Warren, 333.
Health of India. Roads, Railways and Canals, and the, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A., 315.
Hewitt, J. F., *The Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, 318.
Hindu Civilisation, 123; Hindu Wedding, Collision at a, 229.
History, Lord Acton on the Study of, 329.
Home Charges and the Royal Commission, by T. Lloyd, 188; Sir G. Wingate's Opinions, 367.
Honours and Decorations in the Chitral Campaign, 237; Chitral Honours, 227.
Hume, A. O., C.B., The Wolf and the Lamb, 21; To Friends in India, 369.
Hunter, Sir W. W., K.C.S.I., M.A., LL.D., *The Old Missionary*, 347; Speech, 355.

I.

Imperialism, Democracy and, by A. E. Fletcher, 209.
Import Duties, Cotton Goods and the, 28, 36, 65, 98; Debate on the Cotton, 106; The Indian Import Duties, 269.
India, Closured, 265; India—What Next? by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 274; Lord Brassey on, 47; Social Movement in, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 81; The Village Community in, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 139; British Policy in, 175; Indian Trade and Trade in, 182, 233; The New Secretary for, 236.
Indian Problem, The: Sir L. Griffin's Guesses Thereon, by "A Tartar," 114; by Jnanen N. Ray, 117; *Indian Scenes*, 190.
Indiana, 1, 33, 65, 95, 129, 161, 193, 226, 257, 289, 321, 353.
Invasion of Afghanistan, The New, by An Anglo-Indian, 9.

J.

Javerilal's, Mr., Presidential Address, 3.
Judicial Member of Council, Appointment of a, 2.
Judiciary and Executive in India, The, 360.
Jury Bill, The, 336, 354.
Justice in India, Administration of Civil and Criminal, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A., 91; Administration of, 197.

K.

Kabul, Chitral and, by J. Dacosta, 211.
Klein, A., *Among the Gods*, 190.
Knight, M. S., *Krishna Kanta's Will*, 349.

L.

Laccadive Islands, Attempt to Annex the, 4; Madras Government and the, 132.
Lamaism, 111.
Lamb, The Wolf and the, by A. O. Hume, C.B., 21.
Lancashire, An Appeal to, 152; Lord G. Hamilton and, 296; and the Cotton Duties, 323.
Lansdowne on Chitral, Lord, 377.
Law in India, Observance of, by J. Dacosta, 343.
Lawsuit, An Indian, 6.
Leaf, W., Litt. D., *A Modern Priestess of Isis*, 64.
Leitner, Dr. G. W., on the Future of Chitral, 228; on Kafirístan, 358.
Liberals, Defeat of the, 226; Rout of the, 232.
Lloyd, T., on Some Aspects of Indian Finance, 140; on the Home Charges and the Royal Commission, 180.
"Locations" in the Transvaal, Separate, 293.
London Letter, Our, 10, 41, 75, 106, 136, 173, 202, 235, 266, 298, 331, 364.

M.

Macmillan's Indian Studies, 78.
"Madras Review, The," 166.
Máhárája of Mysore, Death of the, 34, 102.
Malleson, Col. G. B., C.S.I., *Life of the Marquess of Wellesley, K.G.*, 222.
Manchester, India and British Constituencies, Meeting in, 185.
Manning, Interview with Miss, 238.
Marathas, Ballads of the, 31.
Medical Handbook, Anglo-Urdu, 224.
Military Aggression and the Budget, 135; Expenditure, 100; Proposed Reductions in Military Expenditure, 230 (see also "Chitral," "'Forward' Frontier Policy," etc.).
Mirza Haidar's History, 220.
Morgan-Browne, H., LL.B., on Lord G. Hamilton's Budget Speech, 313; Retirement of, 198.
Müller, F. Max, K.M., *Chips from a German Workshop*, 40, 191.
Murison, Prof. A. F., LL.D., on Mr. Fowler's Opportunity, 17; The Social Movement in India, 81; The Village Community in India 139; The India of the Veda, 213; Education in India, 241; India—What Next? 274; Entrance to the Civil Service, 340; The Coming Congress, 371.

N.

Naoroji, Mr., Defeat of, 226; On His Defeat, 241; Disappointment at, 259, 324; Farewell to the Speaker, *Standard* and *St. James's Gazette* on, 132; The Fear of Russian Invasion, 279.
National Reform Union, India and the, 162, 184.
Noble Life, A, 347.
North-West Frontier, The, 29.
Novel, An Indian, 349.
Nundy, A., on Indian Christians and the Congress, 372.

O.

Observance of the Law in India, by J. Dacosta, 343.
Onslow, Official Career of the Earl of, 226; Earl of Onslow and the Famine Insurance Fund, 259.
Opium Commission, Anglo-Indians and the, 188; Cost of the, 101; Report of the, 164; Questions Submitted to the, 165; Sir Jos. Pease on the Opium Traffic, 165.
Opportunity, Mr. Fowler's, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 17.

P.

Palmerston, Lord, 350.
Papers, Recent Parliamentary, 288, 320, 352, 384.
Parliamentary Committee and the Indian Budget, The Indian, 215, 268; The Indian Parliamentary Committee, 259.
Paul, Herbert W., M.P., The Debate on the Cotton Duties, 113; The General Election, 273.
Permanent Settlement: Its Suggested Extension, The, by F. Pincott, 53.
Policy in India, British, 175.
Poona, Lord Sandhurst at: Address from the Sarvajanik Sabha, 253; The Riot at, 2.
Poppies, Removing the Tall, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., 305.
Prehistoric Races, 318.
Press, The Native, 321.
Programme, The Commissioners', 326.
Protap Chandra Rai, Death of, 72.
Protest Against Railway Extension in India, 16, 48.
Provincial Conference, Seventh, 26; Eighth, 268.

R.

Railway Extension in India, A Protest against, 16, 48.
Ranjitsinhji, Mr. K. S., 262.
Rasakusumakar, 133.
Raverty, Major H. G., on the "Forward" Frontier Policy, 158.
Religious Disturbances at Dhulia, 324; Riots in India, Memorial of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha, 43.

Retention of Chitral, The, 305, 307, 310 (see also "Chitral," etc.).
Retrospect and a Moral, A, by J. Dacosta, 307.
Revenues, Enquiry into the Expenditure of Indian, 100.
Roads, Railways, and Canals and the Health of India by Parbati C. Roy, B.A., 315.
Roberts and Indian Frontier Defence, Lord, by J. Dacosta, 147.
Rogers, Dismissal of Mr. Arthur, 71.
Rosebery, Lord, on Chitral, 278,
Ross, G. Denison, *A History of the Moghuls of Central Asia*, 220.
Rout of the Liberals, The, 232.
Roy, Parbati C., B.A., on The Disintegrating Effects of English Law Courts on Indian Society, 24; The Administration of Civil and Criminal Justice in India, 49; The Administration of the Survey Department in India, 247; Superfluous Offices in the Administration of India, 281; Roads, Railways, and Canals and the Health of India, 315; Sir Charles Elliott's Administration in Bengal, 337.
Rural India, 134.
Russia, The Fear of, 32[illegible]; Russian Invasion, The Fear of, by Dadabhai Naoroji, 279.

S.

Saint-Hilaire, J. B., *The Buddha and His Religion*, 348.
Sanders, Lloyd C., *Life of Viscount Palmerston*, 350.
Sandhurst, Lord, at Poona: Address from the Sarvajanik Sabha, 22[illegible], 253; Reception at Bombay, 101; and interpellations, 357.
Schools for Married Indian Girls, 207.
Scientific Frontier, Our, 358.
Scope of the Royal Commission, by H. N. Haridas, 342.
Secretary for India, The New, 236.
Shahzada's Visit, The Cost of the, 196, 351.
Simultaneous Examinations, Petitions in Favour of, 102, 262.
Small, Rev. G., M.A., *Anglo-Urdu Medical Handbook*, 224.
Social Movement in India, The, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 81.
Stansfeld, Presentation to Sir Jas., 326.
Strategist, A Blundering, 103.
Stuart, Prof. J., M.P., The Cantonments Question, 23.
Superfluous Offices in the Administration of India, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A., 281.
Survey Department in India, The Administration of the, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A., 247.

T.

Teachings of the Vedas, The, 75.
"Tempora Mutantur," 262.
Theosophistry, 64.
Thorburn, S. S., B.C.S., *Asiatic Neighbours*, 29.
Thornton, T. H., C.S.I., D.C.L., on the Career of Colonel Sir Robert Sandeman, 197.
Tirhut, Riots at, 229.
Trade in India, Indian Trade and, 182, 233.
Trans-Frontier Aggression, 104.
Tyabji, Mr. Justice Budrudin, 356.

U.

Umra Khan, The Expedition Against, 98 (see also "Chitral," etc.).

V.

Veda, The India of the, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 213; Vedas, The Teachings of the, 75; *Vedanta Philosophy, The*, 287.
Veharidas, Death of Mr. Haridas, 259.
Village Community in India, The, by Prof. A. F. Murison, LL.D., 139.

W.

Wacha's, Mr. D. E., Presidential Address at the Provincial Conference, 261, 268.
Wanted: A More Excellent Way, 38.
Waziristan, The War in, 72; Aggressive Operations in, 99; Results in, 199; The *Pioneer* and the War in, 163.
Webb, Mr. Alfred, M.P., Presidential Address of, 33, 57; Luncheon at National Liberal Club in Honour of, 68, 84; Opinions of the Press, 90; Interview with, 91; Farewell Address at Bombay, 92; Farewell Address, 67; Articles on India, 130; Opinion of Indian Character, 131; On Popular Representation for India, 131; Intended Resignation of, 260; On Simultaneous Examinations, 34; "Ex Uno Disce Omnes," 281.
Wedderburn, Sir W., Bart., M.P., Chitral Relieved, 145; Removing the Tall Poppies, 305; Congratulations to, 259, 324.
Wellesley, Marquess of, 222.
Westland's Budget, Sir J., 198.
Wilson, A. J., Notes on the Indian Budget, 177.
Wingate on the Home Charges, Sir George, 367.
Wolf and the Lamb, The, by A. O. Hume, C.B., 21.

078219

INDEX TO SUPPLEMENT.

A.

Abor Tribes in Assam, 1.
Act, India and the Finance, 55 ; Rules under the Cantonments Acts, 66.
Administration of Justice in India, 2.
Agency, The Gilghit, 42.
Aggression, Trans-Frontier, 44, 56 ; Cost of, 57.
Alliances with Burmese Women, 15.
Allowances, Crimean and Indian Compassionate, 89.
Amendment to the Address, 2 ; Mr. Maclean's, 100 ; Sir W. Wedderburn's, 119.
Ammunition in Chitral, British, 67.
Anglo-Indians and the C. D. Acts, 2.
Annual Exodus to Simla, 64.
Arming of the Kashmir Contingent, 82.
Army, The Indian, 42 ; in India, Strength of the British, 64 ; Medical Staff, 82 ; Officers of the Indian, 65.
Average Income in India, 44, 56, 57.

B.

Balladhun Magistrates Again, The, 69 ; Punitive Police at, 16.
Bengal, Coolie Recruits in, 12, Taxation in, 60.
Bhartpur, The Máhárája of, 56, 68, 82.
Bhousla, The Fund, 42 ; The Palace, 42.
Bill, The Indian Cantonments, 2, 58, 64 ; East India Railway, 2, 52, 55 ; The Police Amendment, 41 ; Proposed Police, 64 ; Sir J. Lambert's, 58.
Bimetallism, India and, 37.
Bombay Civil Fund, The, 14.
Budget, The Indian, 92, 114.
Burdens of Indian Taxpayers, 100.
Burma, Waste Land Grants in, 12.
Burmese Women, Alliances with, 15.
British Indian Subjects in the Transvaal, 67, 68, 82 ; Navy, India and the, 43 ; Soldiers and Indian Revenues, 67.

C.

Cadets, Indian, 68, 70.
Cantonments Bill, The Indian, 2, 58, 64 ; Rules under the Cantonments Acts, 66.
Case of Captain Holmes, 53 ; of Mr. Kunhi Kannan, 67 ; of Mr. Arthur Rogers, 15 ; of Surgeon-Major Smith, 61.
Ceylon, Railway Extension in, 66.
Charges, for Troops, 41 ; The Home, 44.
Chitral, Invasion of, 55, 57, 58, 59 63, 65 ; British Ammunition in, 67 ; Occupation of, 67 ; Relief of, 59 ; Government's Policy in, 60, 64, 92 ; Future Policy in, 70, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88 (see also "Indian Budget").
Civil Department, Leave Rules and the, 56 ; Bombay Civil Fund, 14.
Colleges in India, Schools and, 60.
Commission, The Hemp Drugs, 1, 53 ; Report of, 63 ; on Indian Expenditure, Royal, 60, 65, 67, 83 ; The Opium, 59, 71 ; Report of, 1, 2, 13, 58 63, 69, 71 ; Expenses of, 41.
Committee on Military Works, The, 43.
Compassionate Allowances, Crimean and Indian, 89.
Compensation Allowances, Exchange, 92.
Concessions to Railway Companies, Government, 68.
Congress, The Government of India and the Indian National, 56.
Conjugal Rights, Restitution of, 59.
Contagious Diseases Acts, Anglo-Indians and the, 2.
Contracts, India Office, 1,
Conveyance of Rails to Calcutta, 68.
Coolie Recruiting in Bengal, 12.
Cordite, Manufacture of, 41, 43.
Corps, Indian Staff, 64, 69 ; Officers of the, 89.
Correspondence, The Kythal, 89.
Cost of the India Office, 41.
Cotton Duties, The Indian, 42, 68, 91.
Council, The India, 16.
Crimean and Indian Mutiny Pensions, 42.
Currency and Trade Unions, The, 44.

D.

Delhi-Samasata Railway, The, 69.
Dollar, A British, 42.
Duties, Cotton, 42, 68, 91 ; Indian Import, 1, 13, 16, 56, 108 ; on Spirits, Excise, 50.

E.

Empire of India Exhibition, 67.
Estimates, India and the Navy, 43.
Europeans, Salaries paid to, 41.
Examinations, Simultaneous, 64, 92.
Exchange Compensation Allowance, 92.
Excise Duties on Spirits, 50 ; Revenue in the Punjab 56.
Expedition against Umra Khan, 52 (see also "Chitral").
Expenditure, Frontier, 14 ; Indian, 2 ; of the Indian Revenues, 58 ; The Royal Commission on Indian, 65, 67, 83 ; Indian Financial (Extra Supplements for July and August) Military, 16 ; on Government Buildings, 69 ; Return of Income and, 83.
Expenses of the Shahzada's Visit, 82, 89.
Extension of the Indian Frontier, 59 ; of the Indian Possessions, 82.
Extent of Poppy Cultivation, 60.

F.

Finance Act, India and the, 56 ; Indian Finance (Extra Supplement for July).
Financial Expenditure, Indian (Extra Supplement for August).
Flogging in the Indian Army, 13, 55, 56, 83.
Frontiers of Rritish India, 65 ; Frontier Expenditure, 14 ; Extension of the Indian Frontiers, 59 ; North-West Frontier, 64 (see also "Chitral," "Indian Budget," etc.).
Fund, The Bhousla, 42.

General List, Officers of the, 57, 66.
Gilghit Agency, The, 42.
Government, Expenditure on Buildings, 69 ; of India and the Indian National Congress, 56.
Grievances of the Staff Corps, 1.

H.

Haidarabad, The Nizam of, 16.
Hamilton, Lord G., on the Indian Budget, 101.
Harcourt, Speech by Sir W., 104.
Hemp Drugs Commission, The, 1, 53 ; Report of the, 63.
Highlanders at Rawal Pindi, 66.
Holmes, The Case of Captain, 53.
Home Charges, 44.

I.

India, and Bimetallism, 37 ; Council, The, 16 ; Frontiers of British, The, 65 ; and the Navy, 50 ; India Office Contracts, 1 ; Cost of, 41.
Indian Army, The, 42 ; Army Officers, 65 ; Budget, 92, 114 ; Cadets, 68, 70 ; Expenditure, Royal Commission on, 65, 67 ; Finance (Extra Supplement for July) ; Railways, 15, 92 ; Troopships, 55.
Import Duties, Indian, 1, 13, 16, 56 ; Lord G. Hamilton and Lancashire, 108.
Invasion of Chitral, The, 55, 57, 58, 59, 63, 65.

J.

Justice in India, Administration of, 2.

K.

Kashmir Contingent, Arming of the, 82.
Kunhi Kannan, Case of Mr., 67.
Kythal Correspondence, The, 89.

L.

Lambert's Bill, Sir J., 58.
Leave, Military Officers on, 57 ; Leave Rules of the Civil Department, 56 ; Leave and Pension Rules, 68.

M.

Maclean's Amendment, Mr., 100.
Magistrates Again, The Balladhun, 69.
Máhárája of Bhartpur, 56, 68, 82.
Malwa Opium, Purchase of, 60.
Manufacture of Cordite, The, 41, 48.
Maps of India, Wanted, Official, 59.
Marriage System in Malabar, The, 53.
Medical Staff, Army, 82.
Military Expenditure, 16 ; Officers on Leave, 57 ; Pensions, 43 ; Stores for India, 69 ; Works, Committee on, 43.
Mines, Women in Coal, 60.
Moral and Material Progress, Statement of, 83.

N.

Navy Estimates, India and the, 43; India and the British, 43, 50.
Newspaper, A Subsidized, 44.
Nizam of Haidarabad, The, 16.

O.

Occupatian of Chitral, 87.
Officers of the General List, 57, 66.
Officials, Parliament and Anglo-Indian, 15.
Opium Commission, The, 50, 71; Expenses of the, 41; Report of the, 1, 2, 13, 58, 63, 69, 71; Premature Disclosure of the Opium Report, 65.

P.

Palace, The Bhousla, 42.
Pay of Indian Soldiers and Carriers, 89; of Surgeon Major-Generals, 59.
Pensions, Crimean and Indian Mutiny, 42; Lieutenant Quilter's Pension, 58; Leave and Pension Rules, 68; Military, 43.
Police Amendment Bill, 41; The Proposed Police Bill, 64.
Policy in Chitral, The Government's, 60, 64, 92, Future, 70, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88.
Poppy Cultivation, Extent of, 60.
Possessions, Extension of Her Majesty's, 82.
Premature Disclosure of the Opium Reports, 55.
Prison-made Goods, Indian, 92.
Punjab, Excise Revenue in the, 56.
Punitive Police at Balladhun, 16.
Purchase of Malwa Opium, 60.

Q.

Quilter's Pension, Lieutenant, 58.

R.

Rails to Calcutta, Conveyances of, 66.
Railways, East India Bill, 2, 52, 55; Indian, 15, 92; Steel for, 16; Extension of, in Ceylon, 66; Railway Companies, Government Concessions to, 68; The Delhi-Samasata Railway, 69; Transfer of Railway Stocks, 67.
Rawal Pindi, Highlanders at, 66.
Relief of Chitral, 59.
Retirement, The Speaker's, 59.
Restitution of Conjugal Rights, 59.
Revenues, British Soldiers and India, 64; Expenditure of the Indian, 58.
Rogers, The Case of Mr. Arthur, 15.

S.

Salaries paid to Europeans, 41.
Schools and Colleges in India, 60.
Sentence, A Severe, 65.
Shahzada's Visit, Expenses of the, 82, 89.
Simla, Annual Exodus to, 64.
Simultaneous Examinations, 64, 92.
Soldiers and Carriers, Pay of Indian, 89.
Speaker's Retirement, The, 59.
Staff Corps, 64, 69; Grievances of the, 1; Officers of the Indian, 89.
Statement of Moral and Material Progress, 83.
Steel for Indian Railways, 16.
Stocks, Transfer of Railways, 67.
Stores for India, Military, 69.
Strength of the British Army in India, 64.
Subsidized Newspaper, A, 44.
Surgeon-Major Smith, 15, 61.
System in Malabar, The Marriage, 53.

T.

Taxation in Bengal, 60.
Taxpayers, Burdens of Indian, 100.
Technical Institute Madras, Victoria, 42.
Times and the Opium Report, The, 60.
Trade Unions, The Currency and, 44.
Trans-Frontier Aggression, 44, 56; Cost of, 57.
Transvaal, British Indian Subjects in the, 67, 68, 82.
Troops, Charges for, 41.
Troopships, Indian, 55.

U.

Umra Khan, The Expedition against, 52.

V.

Victoria Technical Institute Madras. 52.

W.

Waste Land Grants in Bengal, 12.
Westland's Despatch, Sir Jas., 16.
Wanted: Official Maps of India, 59.
Women in Coal Mines, 60.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]
[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 1. (NEW SERIES.)]
JANUARY, 1895.
[SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus" .. 1
The Tenth Congress 6
An Experiment, and After 8
OUR LONDON LETTER 10
Indian National Congress: President's Address and Opinions of the Press 12
The Tenth Congress (Verse) 14
The Financial Difficulties of India 14
Agricultural Banks Association 15
CORRESPONDENCE: "A Protest Against Railway Extension in India" 16
MR. FOWLER'S OPPORTUNITY, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D. 17
THE NEW INVASION OF AFGHANISTAN, by An Anglo-Indian 19
THE WOLF AND THE LAMB, by A. O. Hume, C.B. .. 21
THE CANTONMENTS QUESTION, by Professor J. Stuart, M.P. 23
THE DISINTEGRATING EFFECTS OF ENGLISH LAW COURTS ON INDIAN SOCIETY, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A. . 24
The Seventh Provincial Conference: Address of the President 26
Cotton Goods and Import Duty: Opinions of the Press .. 28
REVIEWS: The North-West Frontier 29
Ballads of the Marathas 31
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects .. 32

Indiana.

On another page will be found Reuter's telegraphic report of the first day's proceedings of the tenth Indian National Congress. Brief as the report is, it has proved too much for the *Times*. Here is the meagre paragraph to which the *Times* reduced Reuter's message:—

> "Madras, Dec. 26.
>
> "The Indian National Congress was opened here to-day. There were present 1,150 delegates and 3,000 visitors. Mr. Webb, M.P. for county Waterford (West), was elected president. In his opening speech he praised the Indian administration and declared that the aims of the Congress were not directed against the Government of India. The destinies of Ireland and India are closely allied. The prohibition against the carrying of arms was in Ireland an insult to the soil and in India an insult to the race.—*Reuter*."

The telegram as will be seen elsewhere, stated that Mr. Webb was elected president "amid enthusiasm." The *Times* omitted these two words. Again, according to Reuter, Mr. Webb "said that the proceedings of former Congresses had been conducted with dignity, fairness, courtesy, and tact." The *Times* omitted the passage. Readers of INDIA may be amused to make further comparisons. Now, if omissions of this kind are accidental it is curious that they should occur annually—for the *Times*, as we have shown, performed similar acts of mutilation before. If they are not accidental, it is hard to see what the object of the *Times* can be. For the effect of its mutilations is to direct special attention to the passages which it omits.

To the mingled amazement and amusement of the people of Bombay the satirical suggestion that a statue should be erected to the memory of Lord Harris has been taken seriously, and a small but energetic Committee is collecting subscriptions for the purpose. It would seem that the scandal connected with Lord Lansdowne's statue—a scandal to which the attention of the House of Commons was rightly called—is about to be repeated, for the following begging letter has been circulated among the Indian princes and chiefs:—

> "His Excellency the Right Hon. Lord Harris, G.C.I.E., leaves this country early next year, on the expiration of his term of office as Governor of Bombay.
>
> "There is a general desire on the part of the various communities to testify fully before his departure to the high and sincere esteem in which his Excellency is held. His straightforward and manly intercourse has struck all those whose privilege it has been to come across him.
>
> "It is proposed that some permanent memorial, as a token of the esteem in which his Excellency has been held, be raised.
>
> "May we ascertain if your Highness is prepared to take a prominent part in the movement, and to allow your name to appear in the list of contributors?
>
> "If, as is expected, the answers to the preliminary appeal are favourable, then a public meeting will hereafter be held, at which the announcement of your Highness's subscription will be made, and the whole matter brought before the public."

This appeal is signed by three residents in Bombay whose information as to the desires of "the various communities" must, to say the least, be peculiar. A prominent Indian citizen of Bombay writes to me that "the promoters of the movement have so far kept their plans secret. As soon as they are able to collect about Rs. 50,000, they mean to call a meeting of the inhabitants of Bombay and give the movement a public character. The English papers here are studiously silent. By this movement it is proposed to delude the public in India and in England into the belief that the administration of Lord Harris has been popular, while the fact is that it has proved to be a byword for incompetence and reaction and for being out of touch with the people of the Presidency." It remains to be seen whether the people to whom the begging letter has been addressed will have the courage of their opinions. In any event, it is certain that no such appeal ought to have been made. Lord Harris will hardly derive much satisfaction from a machine-made compliment of the kind which some of his too zealous friends are endeavouring to pay him—out of other people's pockets.

The Poona riot cases, which were lately the centre of public interest in India, have ended, as they were expected to end, in the acquittal of the accused Hindus. "The best thing is now," as the *Kaiser-i-Hind* says, "to forgive, forget, and live in peace and amity." It turns out that the Muhammadans were the aggressors, and that the action on the part of the Hindus which was described as illegal had the support both of law and of custom. But what is to be said of the conduct of the police in these cases? The *Times of India* is not in the habit of censuring officials, but for once it has been compelled to write in plain terms. It says:—

> "The trial has brought into view questions connected with the veracity—or otherwise—of the Poona police which cannot be allowed to pass unnoticed. More than once during the proceedings an apology was put in for them, which reads very much like 'What can you expect for seven rupees a month?' What the public have a right to expect, however, is a reasonable measure of veracity even at that price, however moderate an amount of intelligence can be got for it. We cannot treat as a mere episode of a Mofussil Court a judicial examination of the evidence of arrest in thirteen cases, ending in the evidence in each case being set aside by a clear-headed and discriminating judge as unworthy of belief. Little that is better can be said of the prosecution of Tatya Saheb Natu. It is not conceivable that greater care in the preparation of the case would have affected the result here; but it is conceivable that a more careful regard for what it would be necessary to prove against the defendant before a conviction could reasonably be hoped for would have discouraged the police from entering upon what at best could be looked upon only as a forlorn hope."

And, again, the *Times of India* writes:—

> "We can only regret that the subordinate police authorities thought it necessary to restrain a procession which was being conducted in the exercise of a common law right which in itself was not disorderly, and which could provoke retaliation only from people bent upon disorder."

But even the action of the police in these Poona cases is not the worst part of the discreditable business. Lord Harris, on the strength of evidence which he cannot have sifted, permitted himself during his recent tour to make general accusations of sedition and disloyalty against the Brahmans of the Deccan. A correspondent of the *Times of India* who signs his letter "A Poona Brahman," and another correspondent who signs his letter "An Outsider," have given complete and spirited answers to these groundless accusations. But the accusations ought never to have been brought. Irresponsible persons have a habit of drawing political inferences from religious dissensions. But the Governor of Bombay is not an irresponsible person, and when he brings wholesale charges against the Brahmans of the Deccan he is expected to have weighed his words. He would probably repudiate with indignation the suggestion that he was pursuing the policy of "Divide and Rule." But it is, to say the least, deplorable that his speeches and his actions should lend colour to the suggestion. It is the business of the Government to understand the people, not to exaggerate their differences and to establish a reign of terror. Nobody who is in touch with Indian opinion in the Deccan would deny that something perilously akin to this has resulted from Lord Harris's ill-considered words. The *Kaiser-i-Hind* says that "it is to be earnestly hoped that Lord Harris, on behalf of the Government, will make the *amende honorable* which is now due to the community, especially after the intemperate and unstatesmanlike utterances in which he indulged." Lord Harris has a reputation for candour. We shall now be able to judge how far he deserves it.

I hear from a well-informed correspondent that, unless rumour be false, the Judicial Member of the Council of the Governor of Bombay is about to be absent on leave, and that his place will be filled up not by a member of the Judicial Service but by a member of the Revenue Service. The proposal is condemned as deplorable by leading Indians in Bombay. The system by which one member of the Revenue Service and one member of the Judicial Service are members of the Executive Council has, on the whole, worked extremely well. Knowledge and experience of both of the great branches of the Service have thus been placed at the disposal of the Council, and the intention—if intention there be—of dispensing with a Judicial Member is now regarded with general misgivings.

But who is to be the Judicial Member? It has hitherto been the custom in Bombay for the Council of the Governor to include a member who has held for a time the office of a puisne judge of the High Court. There are grave objections to this arrangement. The High Court is the highest judicial tribunal in the Presidency, and it is essential that its judges should have little to fear in the way of degradation, or to expect in the way of promotion, from the Executive Government of the Presidency. The Executive Government cannot at present suspend or dismiss a judge who gives offence to them, but, in order to remove him from the bench, they may promote him to a seat on the Council. Or a judge who expects promotion from the Executive Government may be punished by refusal of a seat on the Council. There is, I understand, a strong opinion in India that in the interests of judicial independence all such promotions should cease, and that the power of promoting or transferring judicial officers in a district should be vested solely in the High Court. If this plan were carried out the Government could appoint either the Advocate General or the Remembrancer of Legal Affairs to be the Judicial Member of Council.

The Presidential Address which Mr. Javerilal U. Yajnik delivered at the Seventh Provincial Conference, held at Bombay in November last, is a notable contribution to the literature of Indian reform. It is a pity that some more permanent shape is not given to such careful and comprehensive addresses. It is of course impossible to perpetuate on paper the real value of Conferences and Congresses which consists, as Mr. Javerilal said, in the opportunities they give to delegates from different parts of the country "of comparing notes and exchanging ideas on matters affecting their common welfare." But students of Indian affairs would be the gainers if addresses like this of Mr. Javerilal's, and like that which Mr. Naoroji delivered at the Lahore Congress, were collected and published in periodical volumes. Speaking in a commercial city, Mr. Javerilal naturally referred at the outset to the Government's experiment of closing the mints. It is, as he said, notorious that the result of the experiment is a dismal failure, and Bombay has suffered from its effects probably more than any other part of India. Of the exemption of cotton goods from the five per cent. import duty of last year Mr. Javerilal spoke in indignant terms. Lord Northbrook has said: "There is one simple test which we may apply to all Indian questions. Let us never forget that it is our duty to govern India, not for our own profit and advantage, but for the benefit of the natives of India." "Video meliora proboque, Deteriora sequor," Lord Kimberley confessed in effect last year, and public opinion in India strongly resented the subordination of Indian interests to the demands of Lancashire. Since Mr. Javerilal spoke, that reproach has to some extent been removed. The "invidious distinction" in favour of imported cottons no longer remains.

Mr. Javerilal, however, was not content merely to reproach the Secretary of State for his decision of last year. He perceives that import duties are but a temporary expedient:—

> "I may say at once, what I believe to be the case, that the people of India did not and do not desire the re-imposition of cotton duties or any import duties at all if the condition of Indian finance can dispense with it. And if the powerful influence of Manchester could be brought to bear upon the reduction of the overgrown military and civil expenditure so as to dispense with the necessity of extra taxation, we have no particular wish to see them levied again."

That is the root of the matter. It is common for the opponents of reform to say that complaints as to excessive military expenditure in India proceed only from ignorant fanatics. Is Sir David Barbour an ignorant fanatic? Is Sir Auckland Colvin an ignorant fanatic? These gentlemen, who have held the office of Finance Minister in India, support the Indian National Congress in the opinion that the perilous growth of military expenditure lies at the base of India's financial embarrassment. "If," wrote Sir Auckland Colvin in his article in the *Nineteenth Century*, "this paper correctly interprets the meaning of the figures which are embodied in it, it shows that there are good grounds for the assertion in the recent 'Note' presented to Parliament by Sir William Wedderburn, which shows that it is more the growth of expenditure than the fall in exchange which has led to the present difficulties." The Select Committee for which Mr. Fowler has undertaken to move at the beginning of the Parliamentary Session will have an opportunity, unless its powers are stupidly limited, of probing the evil to the bottom and of prescribing a remedy.

Some of Mr. Javerilal's most important observations upon other topics are reproduced on another page. He is rightly dissatisfied with the work of the Provincial Legislative Council in point of quality and of quantity alike. It is not only that the Council has met too rarely—once in Bombay during the last cold season and twice in Poona during the rains—but the official replies to interpellations are unsatisfactory, and the right of speech is unreasonably limited. We have discussed in former issues of INDIA Lord Harris's application of the closure to Mr. Javerilal when the latter wished to discuss the enhancements of land revenue during the debate on the Provincial Budget. In regard to the new forest policy of the Government, Mr. Javerilal joins in the chorus of praise which has greeted Lord Elgin:—

> "The Government of India deserves the cordial thanks of the public for its renewed declaration of the true policy which should actuate subordinate administrations in conserving forests. The first public act of the Earl of Elgin needs to be hailed with satisfaction in all parts of the country. (Cheers.) Let us devoutly hope that it is the glad harbinger of a new departure in the adminstrative policy of the Government—a policy of sympathy in every way calculated to allay unrest and promote contentment among the dumb masses. (Cheers.)"

A Bombay correspondent sends me the following instructive instance of official high-handedness in India. It appears that a benevolent Parsi built a well in a conspicuous part of Bombay just one hundred and seventy-five years ago for devotional purposes as well as for the supply of drinking water for men and cattle. The lineal descendants of Bhica Behram—for that is the name of the pious founder—have loyally administered the charity at their own expense. Not a penny was ever expended upon it by the Government or the Municipality. But last year a nice little official conspiracy was hatched with the view of claiming official control over the well and the outlying ground. The benevolent Government of Bombay had been casting wistful glances at the site as a suitable place for a statue of a bygone administrator, or, as they now say in India, "exalted mediocrity." First of all, it was necessary to remove from the well the marble tablet which commemorated the good deed of the charitable Bhica. A *posse* of policemen about fifty in number appear to have accomplished this act. The present administrators of the charity thereupon instituted legal proceedings, impugning the claims of the Public Works Department and the Municipality. The result was that the latter gave way for the moment, but they still pretend to have a claim to the site of the well and the surrounding shed. In order, presumably, to support this pretence, the Public Works Department spent a few rupees lately in making straight the ground in front of the well. Challenged to establish their claim, or to show that so much as a *pie* had been spent by them on the charity during the last 175 years, they ransacked the State records to discover a scrap of evidence, but in vain. They next contrived to repair the strip of ground with a view of setting up a claim. Is it surprising that official highhandedness like this exasperates Indians?

Mr. A. O. Hume exposes on another page what—if the facts are as they appear to be—can only be described as the impudent attempt of the Government of Madras to annex the Laccadive Islands. I need not repeat here the details which Mr. Hume's graphic narrative sets forth. Suffice it to say that the Government of India, having sequestrated the islands on stated conditions for alleged arrears of tribute, now declares to the Sultan, through the Collector of Malabar, that it is not likely to restore the islands to him under any circumstances. This is the central fact of the hateful business, and it merits the prompt attention and interference of the Secretary of State for India. Indeed every Englishman who values the fair fame of his country as he values his own personal honour—every Englishman, that is, who possesses the beggarly elements of patriotism—is directly concerned in seeing this injury redressed. When the House of Commons reassembles, we shall undoubtedly hear more of the matter.

Mr. J. Dacosta writes: A British force has once more crossed the North-Western frontier of India and invaded the territory of certain Afghan tribes for the purpose of bringing them under British rule. The territory in question extends from the Suliman range opposite Dehra Ismail Khan to an undefined line in the interior of Afghânistan, which we arbitrarily assume to be the south-eastern limit of Abdur Rahman's kingdom; and we found our right to annex that territory upon a secret agreement with the Amír, concluded in November, 1893, which secures to us, as we allege, his neutrality in the present war. How an agreement with Abdur Rahman can give us the right to occupy a territory over which we deny his supremacy, it is not easy to understand. Moreover, when Abdur Rahman declared to us in 1880 that he mounted the throne of Kabul as the grandson and heir of Dost Muhammad Khan, and claimed to rule the entire kingdom which had been ruled by his grandsire, we accepted those conditions before evacuating his territories, and nothing has since transpired to justify our disregarding the terms to which we then gave our adhesion. At the same time, if the Amír has actually, as we allege, promised not to oppose our advance in Waziristan, the present war can scarcely be considered as an attack on his kingdom, and must be looked upon simply as a war of conquest waged against the Mahsud Waziris and other Afghan tribes whose country we are trying to subjugate. It behoves us, under any circumstances, to inquire whether the acquisition of the invaded territory is likely to promote British interests in India or elsewhere, and whether our scheme of conquest is likely to prove successful. The scheme is not confined to Waziristan: it contemplates the subjugation of the entire tract of mountain country running along the Indian frontier, which has been vaguely described as the borderland of Afghanistan—a barren region which could, under no possible conditions, be made to repay any appreciable portion of the cost of conquering it; while to hold it under British rule would involve an unlimited expenditure for which no provision appears to have been made.

The Government, however, allege that our advance into Afghan territory is required for the security of our Indian possessions against a Russian attack through Afghanistan; and the execution of their scheme, known as the "forward policy," has been attempted for eighteen consecutive years, at an appalling expenditure of Indian revenue, but without the slightest progress having been achieved in the undertaking. Indeed, the result of each attempt has added to the difficulty of the task, seeing that our continued failures have encouraged the resistance of the tribes, and our aggressive policy has destroyed their faith in our professions of amity. The utter hollowness of the "forward policy" has long been exposed by our highest military authorities, including Lord Roberts, all having emphatically recorded their opinion condemning the scheme for holding, without the concurrence of the Afghan tribes, advanced posts in their territory, in order to engage any Russian forces that might venture to march upon India through the mountains of Afghanistan. The object of the present war, therefore, is the execution of a condemned policy, which, apart from its inherent defects so forcibly indicated in Lord Roberts's despatch of May, 1880, has, after eighteen years of incessant warfare, been found practically impossible, the present further attempt to execute it having already proved a failure.

The British expedition charged with enforcing the boundary demarcation opposed by the tribesmen entered the tribal territory in the last days of October, and was attacked early on the 3rd November, when an armed gathering of tribesmen forced their way into the British camp at Wano, killing and wounding a number of our officers and men, maiming our transport mules, and carrying off many of our best horses and rifles and some of our treasure. Our communications have since been harassed, our convoys plundered, and the advance of our troops has been arrested; and, as the country is now covered with snow, the intended delimitation cannot be proceeded with, and another failure has thus to be recorded in the deplorable series which already marks the military operations undertaken by us in Afghanistan since 1876.

This uninterrupted succession of failures and disasters is (Mr. Dacosta contends) to be ascribed entirely to the anomalous conditions which the Secretary of State for India has brought about, through the misuse of the powers intrusted to him for the better government of India. Under the British constitution when a war is considered advisable in the interest of the nation, the duty is imposed on the Crown to apply to Parliament for the necessary supplies—a condition which imposes on the Executive the salutary obligation of publicly justifying the hostilities which they contemplate before they can involve the nation in a foreign war. This vital principle of the British constitution has been deliberately disregarded, and the spirit of the Act of Parliament constituting the Government of India has likewise been violated, by the Indian revenues being diverted from their legitimate use, and expended in carrying on aggressive wars beyond the frontiers of India. Thus, it is the unconstitutional and illegal acts of the Secretary of State for India that have caused both our disastrous operations in Afghanistan, and the financial difficulties and consequent popular discontent with which we have now to contend in India.

An article has been published in the *Times* of December 17, under the head of "Indian Affairs," which is likely greatly to mislead the reader regarding the hostilities in Waziristan. Referring to the collison which took place between the British force and the tribal gathering at Wano, the writer says: "The crisis once again brought us face to face with the always present dangers, and the ever possible demands for military outlay, which form part of the tenure on which we hold India." This remark and certain allusions in the same article to the predatory and turbulent nature of the Afghan tribes suggest the idea that the present hostilities were undertaken to protect our Indian frontier from the inroads of aggressive neighbours. Such an idea would, however, be entirely opposed to the actual state of the case. No danger of the kind alluded to by the writer in the *Times* has existed for upwards of a quarter of a century; and Lord Roberts, in his above-mentioned despatch, indicated clearly the policy which, in his lordship's opinion, would best secure the safety of India, when he said: "We have nothing to fear from Afghanistan, and the best thing to do is to leave it as much as possible to itself. I feel sure that I am right when I say that the less the Afghans see of us, the less they will dislike us. Should Russia in future years attempt to conquer Afghanistan or invade India through it, we should have a better chance of attaching the Afghans to our interests if we avoid all interference with them in the meantime." The present hostilities, far from having been provoked by any menace of the tribes, or any inroad into our territory, have been initiated by us with the sole object of conquest; and the military outlay involved is destined further to impoverish and embarrass the Indian treasury, without, at the same time, securing the small advance of the British-Indian frontier into Afghanistan, so far as may be judged from the existing state of things and from the lessons of the last eighteen years.

The following notice is reported to be posted on the door of the waiting room at Jalandhar City railway station:

"The native gentlemen are hereby informed that although waiting rooms at stations common for first and second class passengers where such exist are intended to be used by natives just as much as by European passengers of those classes, the former are given to understand that whenever they use such rooms they will have to conform to the style and usages of Europeans, and will not be permitted to sit on the floor or to eat their meals or to smoke their huqqa therein."

Is this what is meant by "India for the Indians"?

In a leading article which appears under the heading "A Disunionist Candidate" the *Times of India* writes: "Sir John Gorst, in presiding over a dinner at the Junior Constitutional Club, at which a Bombay Muhammadan named Raffiuddin Ahmad was put forward as an eligible Unionist candidate for an undisclosed constituency, expressed a strong hope that he might be elected. With perhaps a fuller knowledge of Mr. Raffiuddin than Sir John Gorst can pretend to, we have no hesitation in saying that we devoutly hope he may not. We can lay claim to no special acquaintance with this gentleman's career since he has been in England, though he has taken good care that he shall be heard of; we limit our personal objection to him to the ground that he has never been recognised by any considerable section of his own countrymen and co-religionists as a suitable or an influential exponent of their views and interests. This objection — though it might be put with much more emphasis than we have for the present thought necessary to give to it—is, however, of secondary importance. What we object to most seriously in the candidature of this not very important young gentleman is the deliberate intention which marks it to exhibit before the English constituencies the very dissidences and differences which the best statesmanship of the rulers of India is engaged in reconciling and subduing. The 'banner of our contradiction' must not be raised in England at the time when we are doing our best to lower it here. Whether the Brahmans are going too fast, or the interests of the Muhammadan minority need to be safeguarded, are just the kind of questions that should not be discussed in the heated air of party conflict in England, and we are certain, from what Mr. Raffiuddin has written on the subject that he is about the last person in the world to be capable of discussing them as they ought to be discussed."

"We have," continues the *Times of India*, "no objection to Mr. Raffiuddin simply because he is an Indian candidate. If, indeed, one English constituency thinks it worth while to elect Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji there is no reason why another constituency should not choose an Indian who can represent the broader and more conservative aspects of Indian life and polity which seem to be beyond the ken of the member for Central Finsbury. But most emphatically Mr. Raffiuddin is not the man to do that. No Indian candidate who has appeared hitherto has come forward, as he has, trading upon the rivalries and animosities of the races and sectaries whom he has left behind him. Other candidates have claimed, with more or less of reason, to represent India—not the Brahman against the Mussulman or the Mussulman against the Brahman, but the interests of the country as a whole. It is a new thing for an Indian to carry to England the quarrels of the sects, and to ask a great English party to violate its duty to India by taking sides in them. We appeal to Sir John Gorst, who when the facts are pointed out to him will see what a grave error the Conservative party will commit if they encourage this candidature of discord, to do what he can to summarily extinguish it. Otherwise the party will appear to people in this country to be not so much the partisans of union at home as of discord in India." I find that these opinions represent practically the unanimous judgment of the Indian press.

I take the following "Occasional Note" from a recent issue of the *Pall Mall Gazette*:—

"It is a painful sign of the times that no more attention has been given to the case of Ram Ranjan Chuckerbutty *v.* Ram Narain Singh. Involving as it does a most important question of ijara law, it is surprising that a nation with so many Indian fellow-subjects should have ignored it. The case is briefly this. The talook in question is called Koroya, and Ram Ranjan Chuckerbutty, Raja of Hetampore, is zemindar. The talook contains seven mouzahs, which are locally in the zemindari of the Chuckerbutty. So far the facts are clear and acknowledged on all hands. But stay! They were let out on ijara, and the ijara expired in 1284. Up to 1793, when the arrangement was presumably upset by the French Revolution, the tenants held their mouzahs on gwatali tenure, and that, too, under permanent mokurruri and dur-mokurruri rights. But now observe Ram Narain Singh's point. Originally jungle and infested with tigers, the land, during the odd six hundred and ten years the dispute has been pending, has been improved by some water tanks. Furthermore, the appellant has never held khas. How then can he be regarded as a mere ijaradar? We are surprised that an absolutely khaless Chuckerbutty should claim mouzahs with a dur-mokurruri right staring him in the face. We quite agree with Lord Shand."

The idea of reproducing in this fashion for English readers the technicalities of an Indian suit heard before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was comic enough. At the same time it shows, rather pathetically, how unfamiliar Englishmen are with the life of their Indian fellow-subjects.

FIDUS.

THE TENTH CONGRESS.

WE print on another page a brief telegraphic report of the early proceedings of the Tenth Indian National Congress which assembled at Madras on December 26th, under the presidency of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P. The report, which will be supplemented in our next issue, is a sufficient answer to those who doubt the vitality, or impugn the loyalty, of the Congress movement. Representatives elected by the people gathered together from all parts of India to discuss and to carry resolutions which aim at making British rule more stable by bringing it more into accord with the needs and the aspirations of the millions of that vast peninsula. Mr. Webb was welcomed, as he deserved to be, with enthusiasm. His presence at the Congress was in itself evidence of the larger and more sympathetic interest which the House of Commons is coming to take in Indian affairs. The Indian Parliamentary Committee has made itself a force to be reckoned with, and it has no more stalwart allies than the members of the party to which Mr. Webb belongs. Englishmen, or at any rate English Liberals, will hardly be surprised at this strong, albeit informal, alliance. The hard facts of experience have implanted in the representatives of Ireland a practical sympathy with the claims of India which only a close knowledge of suffering can fully give. Mr. Webb himself is not without individual claims upon the respect and the gratitude of our Indian fellow-subjects. He has long taken a keen personal interest in matters affecting the wellbeing and the happiness of the Indian community and his active sympathies have uniformly been on the side of the weak against the oppression of the strong, and on the side of the dumb masses of the people against the mistakes and the ignorance of well-meaning but prejudiced officials. It may be doubted whether, even yet, the strength of the Indian National Congress is adequately appreciated in Great Britain. Aiming as the Congress does at concentrating educated public opinion in India by means of representation and debate, it attracts from a distance, often, of thousands of miles, many hundreds of delegates directly chosen to speak and to vote on behalf of an immense number of constituents. The Congress has been described in India as "a "mighty assemblage of men gathered from every "part of this vast continent, an assemblage such as "India's proudest days never witnessed—an assem- "blage rendered possible, primarily, only by British "railways, post offices, and telegraphs, and by the "profound peace enjoyed under British rule—an "assemblage composed of men of every race, of "every creed, of every community that in the "aggregate compose the population of India, men "chosen by their fellows to represent their views, "and gathered in one spot and beneath the roof of "one vast hall, gathered together at great personal "sacrifice and much expense to discuss in one "common language, and that language English, "matters not relating to their own petty, private, or "sectional interests, but to the welfare of the entire "country and the whole body of their fellow- "countrymen."

The Congress has met at Madras once before. Mr. Budrudin Tyabji presided over its deliberations in that city seven years ago, and it was then that the Congress was described, in words which have passed almost into the currency of a proverb, as "the soundest triumph of British Administration "and a crown of glory to the British nation." The supporters of the Congress have always admitted that it was British education and the example of British history which rendered the Congress possible. From first to last—from the report of the first Congress which was held at Bombay in 1885 until now—the same strain of loyal gratitude has characterised the proceedings of this great national assembly. But there is another and a less pleasant fact which is brought home to the reader of the reports of the past ten years—the fact, namely, that many of the demands which were put forward in the earliest resolutions have to be put forward still. The need of full parliamentary inquiry into the economic condition of India, the need of separating clearly the judicial from the executive service, the lack of adequate representative machinery in the work of government, of the means of education, of land reform, and of economic readjustment—these and other subjects would seem to have a permanent place in the programme of the Indian reformer. Nobody who gives the subject a serious thought can profess to be satisfied with so dismal a circumstance. It is not right that the chosen spokesmen of public opinion in India should be left to beat the empty air and to pour out, year after year, to deaf ears demands so just that they can hardly be heard without assent. The patience and the moderation of the people of India are remarkable, but it would be idle to imagine that British statesmen can safely regard them as a pretext for indefinite delay. We do not say that the work of the Congress has been in vain. On the contrary, it has accomplished much indirectly by the continual check which the existence of organised and therefore articulate public opinion inevitably imposes upon bureaucratic inclinations, and directly by the legislative reforms which it has been the means of bringing about. The selection of well known supporters of the Congress as representatives of the people under the provisions of the Indian Councils Act is but one proof among many that India is grateful for the results which have been obtained. But the results ought to have been far greater than they are, and if India were not so far removed from the observation and the solicitude of the mass of the British people, the results would undoubtedly be far greater.

Mr. Fowler will doubtless observe the strong protest which the Congress has recorded against his decision—or, to speak more accurately, the decision of the Government of India and the India Council—to ignore, for the time being, the resolution of the House of Commons in favour of simultaneous examinations. The indignation and regret which the

Congress expressed in this sense had already been expressed no less vehemently in mass meetings in various parts of India. Those who persuade themselves that the demand, to which the unprejudiced opinion of the House of Commons gave its assent in June, 1893, comes from only a small section of the Indian community, are greatly mistaken. The House of Commons will have to consider how far it is consistent with its dignity to permit its own paid officials to override its deliberate will. On the subject of Parliamentary inquiry into the condition of India the Congress has spoken with a voice no less certain. Mr. Fowler has promised to move for the appointment of a Select Committee on Indian expenditure; but this, as Professor Murison shows elsewhere in our columns, is not the whole of what the Indian Parliamentary Committee asked. The scope of the inquiry is limited to Indian expenditure, whereas it was essential to ascertain in the first place how much India can afford to spend. What is wanted is a general stocktaking of the kind that was periodical under the rule of the East India Company, and that led to some of the greatest boons which India has received. Still, the half-loaf of Parliamentary inquiry is better than no bread, and at the beginning of the new Session it will be the duty of the Indian Parliamentary Committee to secure as wide a reference as may be, to obtain a more precise definition of the Imperial policy which is described as beyond the scope of the Committee's inquiries, and to take any other steps which may be necessary to render the inquiry as useful and practical as possible. It is not, perhaps, competent for Mr. Fowler's Committee, but it is competent for the Indian National Congress, to recommend the abolition of the India Council. If the House of Commons unduly postpones this disestablishment and disendowment of political antiquities, perhaps, as Mr. Paul has feared, the India Council will abolish the House of Commons. The separation of judicial and executive functions in India is admitted alike by officials and by the public to be essential to the administration of justice. The wonder is not that the proposal is put forward, but that it has not long ago been carried into effect. Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, an official of the highest attainments who was lately appointed Commissioner of Burdwan, has sketched in our columns a practical scheme of reform, and the recent scandal in Balladhun has proved its necessity for the hundredth time. We should not tolerate in England for twenty-four hours a system by which an official adjudicates in his judicial capacity upon the acts that he has himself performed or ordered in an executive capacity. Upon many other subjects also the Congress has repeated opinions which wise rulers ought long ago to have translated into acts, and we need not, on this occasion, discuss them again in detail. All who have a care for the wellbeing of India and for the stability of British rule must rejoice at the enduring vitality of the Congress movement, which draws its strength from large and direct representation of the masses of the Indian people.

AN EXPERIMENT, AND AFTER.

THE Government of India, after some vacillation, has at last decided to impose the five per cent. import duty upon cotton goods which it ought to have imposed last year. The delay has helped the finances of India to sink from bad to worse, and at the same time it has aroused, among Indians of every race and creed, a suspicion that their interests were being subordinated to the interests of a portion of the United Kingdom. That is a suspicion which, to put the matter on the lowest ground, no prudent Government would allow to grow up. Circumstances have now proved too strong for the Government, but even in yielding it acts with unwisdom. There will, as we have often predicted, be a large financial deficit in India, which must be met somehow. The currency experiment has broken down, and the Government is, in acts though not in words, confessing the fact. The rupee was worth about 1s. 3d. in British money when, on the advice of Lord Herschell's Committee, the Government of India decided to close the mints against the free coinage of silver. The Government insisted that an attempt should be made to raise the rupee to 1s. 4d. The attempt was made and persisted in for several months, with the result that the Government locked up about ten millions sterling of idle money in the Indian treasury, and borrowed nearly an equivalent amount in gold in London. This curious policy involved an increase in the home charges, which constitute one of the chief difficulties of Indian finance, while, at the same time, money was made scarce and dear in India and trade was paralysed in consequence. It was evident beforehand to many competent observers that these disastrous results must ensue. But neither Lord Herschell's Committee nor the Government of India admitted the force of the representations which were made to them. After a time, indeed, the Government abandoned the attempt to maintain the rupee at the rate of 1s. 4d., but endeavoured to maintain it, approximately, at 1s. 3d. In spite of all efforts, however, the rupee continued to fall lower and lower. When Mr. Westland prepared his Budget at the end of the last financial year he estimated that the India Council would be able to sell its drafts in London during the current financial year at an average price, approximately, of 1s. 2d. per rupee. Nine months of the year are gone, and the average price has been about 1d. per rupee less than the estimate. There may of course be a recovery during the next three months, but such an event does not at present appear to be probable, and it is highly improbable that the recovery could be so great as to raise the average price for the whole year to 1s. 2d. per rupee. If this forecast be accurate, the present year—like its predecessor—will show a large loss by exchange. It is no longer possible to argue that the blame is due to the way in which the India Council has sold its drafts. Since the beginning of April the Council has, on the whole, acted wisely. It has not forced upon the market more bills or more telegraphic transfers than were wanted. It has sold what the market required, and instead of insisting upon "fancy" prices has accepted what the market was willing to pay. It was undoubtedly a mistake, if any other course was open, to increase the offer of drafts a few weeks ago from 40 to 50 lakhs. The season at which exports become large was close at hand, and it would have been more prudent to wait until the demand for drafts had really increased. But perhaps the Council had no option. It may have been necessary for some reason or other to obtain money. In any case, if the proceeding was a mistake, it was the sole mistake recently made by the Council. The fall in the rupee cannot, therefore, be laid at its door. The fall is a natural consequence of the currency experiment and of the state of trade both in India itself and throughout Europe. It was, as we have again and again predicted in these columns, and as many witnesses warned Lord Herschell's Committee, certain to take place. The currency experiment has failed. The Government has never admitted the fact in words but, as we have said, it has admitted it by its actions. The Government first gave up the attempt to fix the rupee at 1s. 4d. Next it gave up the attempt to maintain it at 1s. 3d. Then it imposed certain Customs duties. And now the cotton duties, so long shirked, have to be imposed.

The outlook for the Budget is bad. As we have more than once prepared our readers to expect, the taxes in India are not coming in freely and the revenue of the railway companies has not proved so large as some had hoped. In short, trade is exceedingly bad in India—nearly as bad as it is in Europe. For the past twenty years India had escaped the various crises that inflicted losses upon the great European countries. The escape was partly due to the fact that India had a sound currency. In other words, the depreciation in silver, about which the Military and Civil Services in India made such a pother, was beneficial to Indian trade. The Government of India has deliberately, but not wisely, interfered with the currency, and India is now involved in the European crisis. The action of the Government had the effect of making money artificially scarce. Traders even in the great cities in India had to pay 10 and 12 per cent. for banking accommodation for months together, while in the interior interest at the rate of 15 per cent. and in some cases 18 and 20 per cent. was charged. These high rates, as was to be expected, checked business. Everything that could be put off was put off, and since that time business of every kind has continued to be slack. The depression thus brought about has, of course, been intensified by the unusually low prices that have been offered in Europe for all classes of goods which India exports. Everybody knows how low the price of wheat is, and it may be said generally that Indian produce is cheaper than it has previously been within living memory. This fact naturally indisposes residents in India, whether they be Europeans or Indians, to sell. Some, of course, must sell, whatever the price may be. But the man who can afford to wait will put off his sales in the hope of obtaining better prices in the future. The war between China and Japan, although in some respects it has benefited India by diminishing the competition of the belligerent countries, has nevertheless excited apprehension, and no man of business is inclined to commit himself far until the result can be foreseen somewhat more clearly. If the reported insurrection in China should spread, it is impossible even to imagine what the result may be. If so great an empire, having so vast a population, is plunged into a condition of anarchy not only will Chinese trade be totally disorganised for the time being, but the fear will also arise that some of the European powers may interfere. What with a rash currency experiment at home, exceptionally low prices in Europe, and war and rebellion in the near neighbourhood, it is not to be expected that there can be in the near future much improvement in Indian trade. Exports will, it is true, increase during the next few months. A certain portion of the crops that are raised must be sold. Seeds and indigo have now for some weeks past been exported in larger quantities, the cotton exports ought to increase, and in a couple of months the new wheat crop will be harvested. But although a considerable increase in the exports may be expected there is no good ground for anticipating such an increase in the demand for Council drafts as will substantially benefit Indian finance or enable the taxpayers and the merchants to increase the receipts of the Treasury or the railways.

It will be a happy circumstance if better relations can be established between Great Britain and Russia. Much of the talk about a Russian advance in Central Asia has been wild and undignified, and much of the alarm has been purely imaginary. But it can hardly be denied that if the relations between so great a military Empire and Great Britain were—as the phrase goes—to "become strained" the near neighbourhood of a Russian force might excite apprehension. It will, therefore, be matter for sincere congratulation if a better understanding can be brought about. But mere political arrangements will not place Indian finance upon a sound footing. What finance in India needs is to be remodelled and reformed from its foundations. India wants a Finance Minister of the highest ability empowered by the Imperial Government and the Government of India to enforce necessary economies and to readjust the incidence of taxation. It is the system of taxation in India which is vicious. Great retrenchments might be made. The military outlay is far too great for the return that is obtained, and the expenditure of the Civil Departments is in many directions extravagant and excessive, while in other directions it is niggardly, and checks the progress of the country. It is to be hoped and expected that the coming inquiry by Mr. Fowler's Committee will prove the case for reform to the hilt, and compel the necessary alterations. But the Government of India itself can do much without waiting for the result of the inquiry. Full inquiry would be indispensable whatever steps the Government of India might now take. But the Government need not therefore sit idle. Perhaps it is useless to urge that the currency experiment which has worked so much mischief should be given up. The suggestion would probably provoke the reply that, having once been begun, the experiment must be tested to the end. Disinterested observers fail to see the force of the argument. In private life nobody praises the man who persists in a mistake. If the Government of India could point to any real advantage as a result of the experiment it would justifiy itself. There would then be a reason for perseverance. But the Government of India can point to no such advantage. On the contrary it has abandoned what it professed to be aiming at, and the new excise duty which is now proposed will make matters worse. Because imported cotton goods are to be taxed five per cent. the Home Government insists that there shall be a similar excise duty upon cotton manufactured in India. If a great revenue were expected there would be at least an excuse for the proposal. But the Finance Minister himself admits that the excise tax will yield practically nothing. On the other hand, it will increase the expenditure, for a new department must be created to collect the tax. Nor is it probable that Government officials will be able to spy upon factories without interfering with healthy development and healthy reforms. And, as Mr. Westland admits that he would not propose the excise duty if he were not compelled by the Secretary of State, the people of India will naturally say that India is being sacrificed either to the crotchets of the home public or to the interests of Lancashire.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Commenting on the appointment of Lord Sandhurst to succeed Lord Harris as Governor of Bombay, the *Daily News* wrote: His father, the first Lord Sandhurst, better known as Sir William Mansfield, had a very successful career in India. After having been thanked by Parliament for his brilliant services in Cawnpore and Lucknow, he became Commander of the Bombay Army, and subsequently Commander-in-Chief. His wife, who survived him for many years, was a prominent politician, and a familiar figure at Liberal meetings, especially in connection with Home Rule. The new Governor, who is closely related by marriage to Lord Spencer, will not have a very easy task in Bombay. The religious animosities of Hindus and Mussulmans are very strong in that Presidency, and the Hindus suspect the Government of favouring the other side. Mr. Fowler's selection is a good one. Lord Sandhurst has done his work well, he is popular at the War Office, and his name is justly respected in India. The extraordinary reputation which Lord Elgin has already acquired, and the independence which he has shown, are strong guarantees for the peace and order of Her Majesty's Indian possessions.

Lord Sandhurst's appointment as successor to Lord Harris as Governor of Bombay is (said the *Daily Chronicle*) a good one. Lord Sandhurst has not had great opportunities of distinction as a member of this Government, but he speaks in the House of Lords with clearness and effect, and he has played a dignified and interesting part in the Progressive movement. He has been a member of the School Board and a candidate for the County Council, and he has shown real grasp and sympathy with the administrative problems in which his mother, Lady Sandhurst, was interested. The Liberal party is not rich in promising young peers. But Lord Sandhurst is distinctly one of them, and his career will be watched by many an old friend with pleasure.

Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., has spent a large part of the Parliamentary recess in his Banffshire constituency, and the local journals have been full of his vigorous political speeches. Sir W. Wedderburn does not forget India in the House of Commons or out of it. In particular at the recent annual meeting of the Aberdeen Liberal Association, he seized the opportunity of placing the Indian problem before British electors. The *Daily Free Press* (Aberdeen) reports Sir W. Wedderburn as saying that "he had spent a good deal of his life in India, and he had got a kind feeling for the dark people there—(applause)—and he had very much rather that money was spent, instead of in taking the lives of those people, in saving the lives of the white people at home—(hear, hear). The policy in India for some time had been of the most mischievous and dangerous kind. The affairs of India seemed to have got into the hands of a military clique which thought of nothing but enterprise and distinction from warlike expedition. (Applause.) They had abandoned the safe policy of Lord Lawrence and Lord Ripon to stay within the boundaries and thus preserve the real safety of India; they had abandoned that policy, and during the last ten years the annual military expenditure had increased more than twelve millions. ('Shame.') If that money had been reasonably well spent, and if it had been necessary expense, there would have been some excuse for it, but the money had been spent on useless, mischievous frontier wars, which had made our neighbours fear and hate us, and had destroyed the natural boundary of mountain and rock which safely preserved our Indian Empire." (Applause.)

"The result of this needless expenditure had been," said Sir W. Wedderburn, "that it was proposed to put fresh duties upon British goods, which would strangle trade and make it still more difficult for the people by the taxation they would be subjected to. The matter was a most serious one, and he was only sorry that the people of this country did not sufficiently realise the extreme importance of this question. (Hear, hear.) The Indian rayats would be of enormous value as customers to this country if they were only reasonably well governed and reasonably prosperous. To supply them with simply the piece of cotton which they threw over their shoulders would require 1,000 miles of cotton to be exported from Manchester every day for a year. That gave them some idea of what sort of customer the Indian rayat might be."

In conclusion, Sir W. Wedderburn said that "he trusted Lord Elgin was doing his best to put a stop to this policy. If it was not put a stop to, Sir Auckland Colvin, Finance Minister to Lord Ripon, had said there were only three alternatives. Either the taxation of the people of India must be increased—and they knew as a fact that it could not be increased without producing the greatest hardship and the greatest discontent; or the British taxpayer must be involved in the payment of the deficit; or India must declare herself bankrupt. He thought that that showed that the matter was one for the serious consideration of every taxpayer in this country. (Applause.) They had a trust in India, and they must do their duty by her, even though it might be a loss; but, if they did their duty, India, instead of being a loss, would be a great inheritance to the people of this country, she would be a source of immense wealth, and, if it were prosperous, such a trade would grow up between this country and India as to be an enormous benefit to the toiling millions both of India and of this country." (Loud applause.)

The National Health Society (53 Berners Street, London, W.) has drawn up a Memorandum of a Scheme for diffusing Sanitary Knowledge among the Women of India, and an Executive Committee has been appointed which includes Dr. Ernest Hart (Chairman), Lady Duckworth, Mrs. Scharliev, M.D., Mrs. Hendley, Mrs. Fleming Baxter, Mrs. Ernest Hart and Mr. S. Digby. The list of those who are interested in the scheme includes the Duchess of Bedford, the Countess of Malmesbury, Mrs. Carmichael, Madame Langrana, Mrs. S. A. Barnett, and Miss Manning.

The Memorandum states that the idea of organising a branch of the National Health Society in India originated with Mr. Ernest Hart, who hopes to visit India this winter in order to form local committees and to interest the public, European and Native, in the diffusion of sanitary knowledge among all classes of the community. In furtherance of this object, it is proposed to endeavour to enlist the sympathy of the women of India, of all castes and creeds. It is proposed that simple and easy literature may be prepared by experienced persons, having the same basis and methods as those of the National Health Society. It is also proposed that the aid of native nurses should be enlisted, and that such Colleges as the Lahore Medical College, Grant Medical College, Bombay, and the several universities should be asked what assistance they could give in the diffusion of sanitary knowledge among women. Small gatherings of native women will be held in school rooms, or in their own houses once a week, to "listen to short stirring addresses from some woman worker who would be able to practically assist anyone desirous of rendering her house more sanitary."

Speaking recently in Birmingham at a dinner given to "Indian Mutiny and Crimean Veterans" residing in that city, Lord Roberts said that there were 209 veterans in Birmingham, varying in age from 54 to 81. Of those 117 were in receipt of pensions. Of the total 95 were classed as not in need of help, 68 were classed as needing help, and 44 as being in distress; and two were not classed at all. The curious thing was that of 68 needing help 44 were drawing pensions. One of them, an ex-sergeant was receiving 1s. 8d. a day. He was very sorry to see so many of his old comrades needing help and in distress, but he thought some of them could not have done quite as much as they ought to have done to help themselves.

The Birmingham people, Lord Roberts said, had responded nobly, but work would be needed, and he should like to see sufficient obtained to relieve all those who were deserving. The State could not, of course, pension every man who had been in the ranks—under the Short Service Act it would be impossible. At the same time he was strongly of opinion that men who left the army with good characters ought to have priority of claim on the Government for certain positions under the Government. He had long been anxious that some scheme of old-age pensions should be adopted in the army, where, from the peculiar conditions of the service, it could be much more easily introduced than was possible in civil life. Some years ago he proposed a scheme. From a calculation which he made it seemed probable that funds would be forthcoming sufficient, or nearly sufficient, to provide annuities for old soldiers and to keep those most in need from the degrading necessity of being a burden to their relations or having to seek refuge in the workhouse.

A retired Anglo-Indian officer has published his notions on the subject of "tips." Colonel Newcome made a sort of royal progress through England on his return from a long sojourn in the East, rewarding post-boys with gold, and making waiters happy with handfuls of silver. This reminds the Anglo-Indian officer that there are no tippers so hardened and profuse as Anglo-Indian tippers. It is so novel for them to be waited on by white faces that they feel inclined to reward the most trifling service. They are, moreover, pleased to be at home again, and touched with the civility they meet with in their journeyings to and fro, and so their hands are everlastingly in their pockets. The retired Indian officer does not object to tips in the abstract, but he enters a protest against the giving of gold to any domestic in a house where one has been staying. It spoils the market, and is unfair to those with slender purses. Five shillings (he considers) is a sufficient reward for a little extra trouble. This is very well; but what about the gamekeepers who are accustomed to return the shooting guest's sovereign with a polite intimation that they never accept "less than paper?"

A large company was present at Earl's Court on December 12th, on the occasion of the laying of the corner stones of the Imperial Palace and the Empress theatre, which are to form a portion of the forthcoming "Empire of India Exhibition." The ceremony was performed by Mrs. Imre Kiralfy. Mr. C. Javal observed that the site of the exhibition would be that which had been occupied by a series of exhibitions during the past few years. A company had been formed and, under Mr. Imre Kiralfy's direction, a sum of upwards of £90,000 would be spent on the erection of buildings suitable for the exhibition.

At the close of the ceremony a luncheon was held, at which Mr. Bhownaggree mentioned that several of the Indian princes were evincing considerable interest in the scheme, and had notified their desire, to send what antiquities of interest they might have.

The exhibition will be divided into four sections —art, industries, manufactures, and antiquities. Money prizes have been offered by the company for the best examples of native art and craft. The manufacturing section will be located in the Imperial Palace, the architecture of which will be on Indian lines. What is termed the Indian city will be devoted to the industrial section. A special attraction will be the Indian gardens, which will form the horticultural portion of the exhibition and the gigantic wheel will be completed before the exhibition opens. The hall of the Rajas is to contain a display of the flora of India. The Queen's Palace will be devoted to machinery, scientific instruments, electrical appliances, agricultural implements, and marine exhibits. The plans of the exhibition have been prepared by Mr. Kiralfy, who hopes to have the whole ready for opening early in May.

INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

TENTH SESSION.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

MADRAS, DEC. 26.

The Indian National Congress was opened here to-day. There were present 1,150 delegates and 3,000 visitors.

Mr. WEBB, M.P. for county Waterford, was elected President amid enthusiasm. In his opening speech the hon. gentleman said that the proceedings of former Congresses had been conducted with dignity, fairness, courtesy and tact. He hated tyranny and oppression, wherever practised, more especially if practised by his own Government, because then he incurred personal responsibility. The speaker praised the Indian administration, and declared that the aims of the Congress were not directed against the Government of India.

Proceeding to draw an analogy between the state of affairs in Ireland and in India, he maintained that their destinies were closely allied. He emphasised the harshness of the Arms Act, declaring that in Ireland the prohibition against the carrying of arms was an insult to the soil, and in India an insult to the race. He commented strongly on India's poverty and the extravagance of her military expenditure, and lamented the unsatisfactory condition of agriculture. After charging England for spreading the drink curse, Mr. Webb, in conclusion, said that two convictions pressed upon him. Firstly, the greatness, apart from its inception, and much of its history, of England's mission in India; and, secondly, that the Congress movement was the necessary and logical outcome and the richest fruit of that noble mission of which the citizens of the United Kingdom should be proud.—*Reuter*.

Writing on December 27th, the *Daily News* said: The Indian National Congress, which met yesterday at Madras, elected Mr. Alfred Webb, member for West Waterford, to the chair. A less revolutionary politician than Mr. Webb, who belongs to the Society of Friends, it would not be easy to find. An Irish Nationalist of the gentlest and most moderate type, he delivered, in the course of his opening address, a warm eulogy of the Indian Government. But, indeed, the fears which the Congress originally inspired have died away, or survive only in the breasts of incorrigible martinets, like Sir Richard Temple and Sir Charles Elliott. The Congress is ostentatiously loyal, and demands only such reasonable reforms as would give the natives of India a more influential voice in the Legislative Councils, and a larger share in administrative work. It is natural that the delegates should meet this year at Madras. For the Government of Madras are strongly in favour of the Resolution which the House of Commons passed in 1893 that Indian candidates for the Civil Service should be examined in India. The Secretary of State, in concurrence with the Government of India, has refused to carry out this Resolution, against which the official protest was very strong. But Mr. Fowler's arguments are not conclusive, and we have not heard the last of the subject. Neither the Congress nor any other conceivable body can claim to represent India as a whole. But every year a larger number of educated natives, Muhammadans as well as Hindus, attend it, while the best type of Anglo-Indians regard its deliberations with interest and favour.

The *Westminster Gazette* (December 27th) said:—We are sorry to see that the *Times* has apparently cut down Reuter's report of the Indian National Congress. It would not matter so much if our contemporary had not done exactly the same thing last December, and the *Times* correspondent in Calcutta were not allowed to say what he has a mind about the Congress any day of the year. In 1893 the *Times* deleted from its Reuter's report Mr. Naoroji's statement that "India content and prosperous, could defy six Russias," and that the Congress was "the most thoroughly representative that has yet been held." The announcement that "prolonged cheers were given for the Queen," and that the agitator M.P. for Central Finsbury actually "dined to-night with the Lieutenant-Governor" was also omitted. Surely, as we remarked at the time, if the *Standard* could print all the interesting message, room could be found for it in the twelve-paged *Times!* To-day our contemporary compresses the Congress telegram into a third of the space which it occupies in the *Standard*. We trust that the *Times*, the only London paper which at all regularly prints Calcutta telegrams of its own written from the Anglo-Indian standpoint, will deal more generously with the despatches reporting the remaining sittings of the Congress. No one can argue that the mere printing of a Reuter's report commits a paper to any particular view of the news the despatch contains.

The *Daily Chronicle* (December 28) wrote:—The tenth annual meeting of the Indian National Congress, now in session at Madras, appears to have opened under gratifying conditions. Some 1,150 delegates and 3,000 visitors are reported to have been present to welcome the president of the year and to hear his inaugural address. It is very unlikely that all the delegates have yet arrived, for many of them have four or five days' railway journey to Madras, even if they be ready to start in time for the preliminary proceedings; and, of course, the visitors will vary from day to day. It would be amusing, if it were not humiliating, to find some of our contemporaries at home, who ought to know better, attempting with foolish virulence to discredit the representative character and the practical capacity of the Congress. "Whatever may be said to the contrary," said Sir Richard Garth, late Chief Justice of Bengal, even half-a-dozen years ago, "it is undoubtedly the fact that the gentlemen who attend these Congresses are for the most part of high social position, and the recognised leaders of native thought and opinion." The same words stand good for the description of every Congress that has been held since Sir Richard Garth expressed that emphatic and well-grounded opinion. It is too cheap to sneer at large at English veneered Babus, and cry up the warlike races as if war were the first and last business of a modern State. According to population, the Hindu delegates necessarily largely outnumber the Muhammadan, although it must be acknowledged with regret that the Muhammadans do stand aloof to an unfortunate extent. "We open our schools," says Sir W. W. Hunter, "to all our Indian subjects of whatever creed or birth. The Hindus, with their practical genius for adapting themselves to the facts around them, have prospered by a frank acceptance of this system of education. But the upper classes of the Muhammadans, with their pride of race and disdainful creed, have stood aloof, and so fail to qualify themselves for the administration of a country which not long ago they ruled." That any Englishman should regard this attitude of a portion of the Muhammadan population with complacent approval, is not a little regrettable. When the *Pall Mall* remarks on the fewness of the Muhammadan delegates present, the reply Mr. Bradlaugh made to a similar allegation by the *Times* is still in point. "I reply," wrote Mr. Bradlaugh, "that in this (the 1889) Indian people's informal Parliament I saw more Muhammadans present than the Conservative leader will muster of Conservatives in the British House of Commons during any portion of this Session." Happily, however, neither the Indian nor the Home Government is subject to any such delusion on this point as some of our contemporaries would apparently like to insinuate into the minds of the more ignorant of the British public at home.

We acknowledge that we should have much preferred if Mr. Webb, M.P., for the West Division of County Waterford, the president of the year, had resolutely refrained from drawing any parallel whatever between India and Ireland. The conditions of the two countries are so vastly dissimilar that every parallel must be incomplete and dangerous, and it is eminently desirable to keep India firmly outside the arena of party politics. Hardly any greater misfortune, indeed, could befall the Dependency than that it should become the victim of party prejudices and animosities, after the deplorable example of Ireland. Otherwise, Mr. Webb seems to have addressed the Congress with sober good sense and enlightened sympathy. When he declared against tyranny and oppression he undoubtedly voiced the unanimous feeling of every fairminded Englishman. It would be rash to affirm that Anglo-Indian officials can justly be charged with intentionally oppressive conduct. Such action is no doubt very exceptional. But it is necessary to look beyond intention to the facts, and then it is easy to understand how even "the picked men we send out to spend their lives in governing India"—men picked by competitive examination in the learning of the schools, and sent out to govern before they have the smallest notion of what government means—may, through lack of knowledge and lack of sympathy, work oppression of a very grievous kind with the best of intentions. Mr. Webb did well to emphasise the fact that the proceedings of the Congress are conducted in no hostile spirit to the Government of India, and to insist on the dignity, fairness, courtesy, and tact which have characterised every one of its meetings and every step in its practical action.

The Congress has already seen good fruits of its travail, and it cannot have long to wait now for a further extension of the representative principle in the supreme and the local Governments, and a fuller admission of natives to higher posts in the administration. The real principle of representation, in fact, cannot yet be said to have obtained recognition in the Governments. Nor is there any place in the Civil Services for men of the character and calibre of Sir Salar Jung, Sir Dinkur Rao, and Sir T. Madhava Rao. The Congress may well ask for a living reason. "Let us face the fact," wrote Mr. James Routledge, with a competent knowledge of India, twenty years ago. "Why have we no place for such men? That they would make revenue to exceed expenditure, and at the same time relieve and foster trade, no one can doubt; but then they would demand the reduction of expenditure, and who knows where the reduction would first appear? This is the whole truth." Men like these great native administrators would very certainly not be now throwing away the money of the people in a worse than vain military demonstration in Waziristan. Next to concern for these questions, if not before them, the Congress will repeat its yearly demand for a separation of executive and judicial functions. The existing system it has ten times denounced as productive of inconvenience, hardship, and injustice. The High Court judges have not hesitated to express strong opinions against the scandalous combination. Even the *Times* has acknowledged that "in theory all Englishmen agree with Montesquieu, who long ago laid down that 'there is no liberty if the judicial power be not separated from the legislative and the executive.' A system which clothes a revenue collector with the duties of a first-class magistrate certainly requires amendment." Why, then, is it not amended? What should we think of a magistrate that first hunted up the evidence against a suspected person in co-operation with the police, and then sat in judgment on the accused upon the evidence he himself had been actively instrumental in collecting? Besides, the executive work ties down the officer so closely that he cannot find time to fit himself for judicial duties. Executive officers, indeed, cannot mix sufficiently with the people so as really to know their feelings and their needs. Here lies a great danger. Perhaps there is no point in the programme that the Congress can drive home more effectively than the general and just dissatisfaction with this intolerable union of incompatible duties in the same functionary. We wish the Congress the highest success in its invaluable work of representing to the Government, with loyal intention and in constitutional methods, the native views and feelings, which the Government itself has no machinery for discovering with any approach to certainty or completeness.

THE TENTH CONGRESS.

1.

OUR Congress meets—has met—once more,
  As bright as brief its reign,
As those to follow—those before,
  Dispersed—to meet again.
Our Tenth, the latest (not the last),
  Be Freedom's path the worst,
Each marks another mile-stone past
  The epoch making First.

2.

And, looking back, may each true heart
  Rejoice our labours in,
And, looking forward, play a part
  In battles yet to win;
Dismay'd nor stayed by rude rebuff
  E'er Freedom's spirit grows,
Her sons are made of sterner stuff
  Than who her cause oppose.

3.

Who serves the cause counts not the cost,
  Would we the past review
Say!—if some hard fought battles lost—
  Our triumphs—are they few?
Who learns to fight learns first to bear
  Hard blows, nor deems he feels,
Ne'er fearing ups and downs to share,
  He rallies while he reels.

4.

As Britons won their liberties
  By standing to their guns,
United such proud victories
  May fall to India's sons.
No wav'ring force may hope to win,
  Nor ranks divided might,
But unity means triumph in
  The fierce, tho' bloodless fight.

5.

When comes the time our task be done,
  When Congress meets no more,
The cause long pleaded, fought for, won—
  Come peace or party war—
Our sons, the Congress lesson taught,
  Will show—tho' matched with might—
The spirit of their sires who fought
  For Justice—Freedom—Right.

WILLIAM E. IMESON.

THE FINANCIAL DIFFICULTIES OF INDIA.

The following letter from a Civilian in India has appeared in the *Manchester Guardian*:—

It is seldom much use to answer articles on Indian affairs that appear in English magazines and newspapers. The correspondent or the writer has aimed at creating a certain impression on the public mind. However complete may be the answer to the statements or arguments, before it can arrive from India the impression has been produced, and will not be effaced. Sir Auckland Colvin's article in the *Nineteenth Century* is a case in point. To the reader not specially informed it will go to prove that the military expenditure is the main cause of our financial difficulties, and that it could have been avoided; and that the next cause is the expenditure on railways. The intention is to divert attention from the currency question, and to show how the military element in the Viceroy's Council succeeded in spoiling Sir A. Colvin's budget. It may be useful to point out that Sir A. Colvin has not attempted to show how the military expenditure he complains of could have been avoided. To anyone who has paid attention to such matters it is idle to point to the map and say that distance and bad roads are India's defence. We have found no difficulty in sending armies from one end of Afghanistan to the other; and for the Russians to place an army of considerable strength on our frontier is merely a question of money and arrangement. To those who know our position in India, and the difficulties that would certainly arise round it if we were attacked, the increase of 10,000 men to the British and 20,000 to the native army will appear no more than was called for by prudence. It is easy to say that if this addition had not been made to the forces the Government of India would not have taken Upper Burma, and would not have entered upon certain minor enterprises. Sir A. Colvin was in the Council in 1886, and ought to know. So far as the public has been informed, the causes that led to the annexation of Upper Burma were not such as Lord Dufferin would have set aside. It was not desirable—nay, it was not tolerable, that French influence should be established in Upper Burma.

I do not for a moment deny that a great deal of money has been spent on defences and expeditions which seem to have been unnecessary. It is very questionable whether the vast sums spent on the Quetta defences and the lines at Rawal Pindi have not been thrown away. The great importance attached to Gilgit and Hunza Nagar seems to some fictitious, but the splendid gallantry of our young officers and their men in the operations at these points has to a great extent silenced criticism. The advance now threatened to Chitral seems to me to be a rash and uncalled-for move, which will place our Political Officer and his escort in a position from which we could not recall him in time of danger, and where we could not give him help if he needed it. To place small garrisons in distant and not easily accessible places on our extreme frontier may lead to disasters very damaging to our prestige and very difficult and costly to remedy or revenge. The annexation of Waziristan, now going on, seems open to very grave criticism. It will certainly cause us very considerable trouble and expense. The costly expeditions against the Kachins in Upper Burma in 1892 are another case in point. These expeditions led to expenditure in money and life—and for what end? Merely that Sima and other places so obtained might be handed over to China under the recent Convention.

These are points on which the actions of the Government of India are undoubtedly open to criticism. But the general strengthening of our army and the improvement of our position by strategic and frontier railways are, I venture to think, justified to all men of Indian experience. The general attack on railway expenditure made by Sir A. Colvin might be set down to ignorance if it came from any other source. Who knows better than he the the enormous advantages, financial and administrative, which the country has derived from the railways? It may be very much doubted if without the railways India could have exported sufficient produce at remunerative prices to pay her debt. How could the surplus wheat of the Punjab or the North-west Provinces have reached the sea? Where would have been the large additions to the land revenue of these and the Central Provinces? What would it have cost to stamp out dacoity and establish a civilised administration in Upper Burma if the railway had not been extended to Mandalay?

My object is merely to indicate a few matters on which those who may have read Sir A. Colvin's article would do well to reflect.

AGRICULTURAL BANKS ASSOCIATION.

A meeting convened by this association was held on December 12th, in St. James's Hall, London, the object being "to elicit a thorough criticism and discussion" of a scheme for agricultural banks proposed by Mr. A. Egmont Hake. Mr. Yerburgh, M.P., the president of the association, occupied the chair.

The CHAIRMAN said that when they found land going out of cultivation, labour driven to the large towns, and farmers unable through want of funds to cultivate the soil, while, at the same time, money was never so cheap, he thought they would agree with him that there was something wrong, and that it was worth their earnest consideration how they could turn this fertilising stream of capital on to the land.

Mr. HAKE, in explaining his scheme, said we were importing huge, ever-growing quantities of live stock, frozen, pickled, and preserved meats of every description, dairy produce, poultry, eggs, fruit, vegetables, and other product—all natural to our English farming; and he thought it was clear that so long as cereals remained the principal product of British farming industry would suffer from the cheap prices abroad. But if our farmers could use these cheap cereals from abroad as their raw material, and could produce the special products he had just referred to as now so largely imported, they would benefit from the cheap price of cereals. They were quite accustomed to hear advice given farmers to reduce their production of cereals and to devote themselves more to *la petit culture*, so successfully pursued on the Continent. He held that it was impossible, under our present financial system, for our farmers to follow this advice. The two difficulties which stood in the way of a rational development of British farming were insufficiency of capital and credit on the one hand and the absence of suitable circulating media on the other. He proposed to obviate these—first, by the adoption of note-issuing methods similar to those which were general in Scotland up to 1844; and, secondly, by allowing the methods of the French *banquier* to graft themselves on the old Scottish methods. The kind of banking methods he advocated would, however, differ in one essential point from the old Scottish methods. Instead of making the notes payable chiefly in a large central office, each bank and each branch would have to redeem its own notes, and treat the notes of other banks and other branches as cheques. The reason for this was that each bank manager would thus be able to exercise a better control over his own market—that was to say, the district round the bank where the notes alone would circulate. The vital condition to the success of the system was that the notes must be entirely free from any State supervision. He did not think that anyone present would deny that our cheques would lose all their usefulness if the Government undertook to supervise them. Incredible as it might seem to many, another advantage of absolute freedom was the practical impossibility of over-issue or of abuse. The Scottish method, with the improvement he had referred to, not only supplied circulating media of exchange to the full requirements of all healthy business, but also brought plenty of capital within the reach of the farmers and other producers. The reason for this, again, was that when private notes were deprived of all Government prestige they could not be circulated at all except through the granting of liberal credits to clients who in the district of the bank carried on a productive business with profit to themselves. The methods for the granting of the credits would be the same as in Scotland—namely, the granting of cash credit accounts against the best obtainable securities, in most cases two or more guarantors. The French *banquier* system benefited France in virtue of the same economic laws which made the Scottish free note-issuing system benefit Scotland—that was to say, it brought capital into the channels of production and withheld it from the channels of consumption and destruction. He proposed that the new banks should be small, limited companies, and that the shares should be of small amount, and should be payable in easy instalments, so as to allow the savings of the people to be invested in the banks. Mr. Hake then dealt *seriatim* with the six points on which he invited discussion. The first was: "Considering the impossibility of disturbing the natural level of coin in the world's markets, as manifested by the prompt redressing influence of the highly sensitive foreign rates of exchange, is it possible to extend industry, increase the number of the employed, raise wages, and augment the consuming power of the masses by adding to the quantity of the circulating coin?" He contended that it was not possible to disturb the level of the world's gold supply. The second point was: "Are such circulating credit-instruments as cheques indispensable to highly developed business, say, such as that in the City of London?" His reply was that such cheques were assuredly indispensable. He thought it would be impossible to clear such a business as that of London with coin. The third point was: "As cheques cannot find a wide application in wage-paying districts in the retail trade, and in all business connected with the working-classes, is it desirable to introduce a circulating credit-instrument capable of being handled by the working-classes and of regulating itself on the requirements of trade?" To work so large a productive business as this nation did with coin for the principal medium of exchange must result in the highest possible cost of production and the highest possible cost of living, on the one side, and in the lowest possible price of sale and the lowest possible wages on the other. Point number 4 was as follows: "Is it necessary that any new credit-instrument, introduced for the benefit of the productive trades and the working classes, should be free from State supervision as cheques are?" Mr. Hake contended that if small notes were adopted as the most practical way of supplying the productive trades with media of exchange they must be absolutely free from Government supervision. Point No. 5 was as follows:—"Given the permission to issue small circulating credit-instruments in the form of promises to pay on demand to bearer, or in any other form, would any one besides banks and bankers issue them?" A little reflection would, he said, at once show that no one could circulate free notes and obtain gold for them. They were payable by the issuer in gold at once, and whoever received them from the issuer would present them at once to the issuer for payment. The last point, No. 6, was, so to speak, the key to the whole of his reasoning. "Can the liberty of banks to issue such credit-instruments as are the most suitable to their market, without authoritative control, be abused to any extent involving public inconvenience or danger?" Every single example that had been put before them of over-issuing or failing free-note issuing banks had invariably turned out to be an example also of the dangers of Government interference—for instance, the failure in the United States in 1838, the mass of bank failures in England before 1844, the failures in Scotland after 1844, when the State interfered, and many others.

The various points were then discussed, and

Mr. WESSLAU, in reply to questions, said he called a credit-instrument any document which represented credit. There was no idea of starting a bank without capital; it would be impossible to do so with an issuing bank. As to the security for the notes there was first the capital of the bank, and next everything that the banker had taken for the loans he had granted.

Mr. HAKE speaking again, stated that the process of issuing the notes would be the same as that followed by banks in Scotland before Sir Robert Peel's enactment was brought into force. The guarantee system was worked very successfully. His desire in advocating his proposed reform was that the struggling poor might be enabled to enjoy a credit system similar to that enjoyed by the wealthy. He did not aim at a system of paper money, but a credit system by means of notes free from any Government supervision, and brought down to the level of I.O.U's. The proposed banks would be subjected to no Government control at all. The effect of free-note issue would be to lower the cost of production and to raise the price of sale.

Commenting on Mr. Hake's plan the *Times* expressed the opinion that "the remedy put forward under the authority of the Agricultural Banks Association seems even more doubtful than that of bimetallism."

Correspondence.

"A PROTEST AGAINST RAILWAY EXTENSION IN INDIA."

To the Editor of "INDIA."

SIR,—Mr. Donald N. Reid's "Protest against Railway Extension in India" in the December issue of INDIA is well meant, and should command the sympathy of sound economists, seeing that Government is the worst possible agent for carrying out any commercial undertaking whatever, be it great or small; but his arguments and statements are loosely strung together, or even mutually destructive. He complains that railways are already overdone, as well as done unwisely, while irrigation works are not; but the fact is that both alike are financial sloughs, the latter actually the worse of the two, and if it be true, as he alleges, that some of the canal-irrigated districts of the North-West Provinces are hotbeds of fever owing to the reckless and extravagant use of the water, the natural inference would be that they are as much overdone as the railways, and that their transference to private hands would be signalised by an immediate curtailment of the water supply. He urges the curious specific objection to railways that they stimulate the export of wheat and oilseeds, which, he argues, ought to be kept at home, and yet he advocates the export of cotton. Wherein lies the difference between exporting cotton which the grower cannot himself wear and exporting wheat which he does not wish to eat? Mr. Reid would compel the rayat to keep his wheat at home by imposing an export duty of 4 annas per maund, so as to give a better supply to the local markets at reduced rates and at the same time benefit the rayat himself. What would Mr. Reid suggest if the rayat failed to see the personal benefit and refused to grow wheat under such conditions? In explanation of his paradox he tells us that the Indian rayat does not wish high prices for his grain because he is a consumer, whereas the British farmer does like a high price because he is a seller. Really! Does the British farmer eat nothing, and conversely has the the Indian rayat no wants which he can supply only by the sale of his surplus produce? But no wonder that Mr. Reid views the export of wheat and oilseeds with alarm when it reduces the rayat to one meal a day of grain (rice, maize, or millet) of the most unwholesome description, or indigestible roots and tubers (not specified) and yet he accepts the estimate that the wheat exported is only one per cent. of the total grain crop of the country. Further that the suppression of this 1 per cent. export would trouble the North-West Provinces and Oudh to exchange their wholesome grain for unlimited quantities of wholesome wheat—surely a grand illustration of the power of littles. But do not roots and tubers, rice and maize, form a large part of British dietary, and what have oilseeds to do with Indian food supply any more than British? Where, moreover, are cotton and indigo to be grown, if all the land is needed to supply the home demand for wheat? Mr. Reid wishes Government to stimulate this wheat supply by gratuitous supplies of manure to the rayats of Behar as there is not sufficient money in the congested districts wherewith to buy it. He would add to this a new system of taking payment of water rent in kind instead of money, and at once, as by the touch of a magician's wand, an average yield of nine bushels per acre from even the best fields will be raised to some unnamed degree of productiveness. Very good. But Government has no magical method of procuring manure, and would just have to tax the rayats of other districts, and if all India is to be so dealt with the rayats of Behar would just have to be taxed in turn for some distant province.—Yours, etc., R. B.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, JANUARY, 1895.

MR. FOWLER'S OPPORTUNITY.

BY PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

It must be acknowledged, undoubtedly, that Mr. Fowler's speech on the motion of Mr. Samuel Smith was, in many ways, bitterly unsatisfactory to the party on whose behalf Mr. Smith moved. The severe strictures that have been passed upon it are not at all surprising, and the energy of them may be taken as an index of the measure of disappointment. Expectation, it may be, ran somewhat too high. On the whole, one is inclined to think that the right view of the situation has been presented by Sir William Wedderburn. Mr. Fowler, we may be assured, did not act on the occasion out of sheer perversity or defiance; nor is it either necessary or proper, in the face of his express repudiation, to entertain the suggestion that he exercised no independent judgment on the case. At the same time, the Secretary of State for India has not claimed the possession of expert knowledge of Indian affairs; and it stands to reason that he should, in the circumstances, rely, at any rate to a very considerable extent, and especially on an occasion of so much importance, upon the cautious counsels of his official advisers. It would be a profound mistake, however, to suppose that because he goes slowly and circumspectly at first, he is disinclined to make any forward movement at all. Perceiving the complications of the subject, and profoundly impressed with a sense of responsibility, he must, even as a matter of personal idiosyncracy, assure himself of the solidity of his footing before he trusts himself to a fresh position. There can be no doubt that he has an open mind on Indian policy in detail, and that, once he has firmly grasped his subject, he will not be afraid to take a line of his own—so far as any Secretary may; and besides, he will certainly not be reluctant to score an Indian success as a pendant to the Local Government Act. It seems to be a very favourable circumstance, in view of the moderate and reasoned action of the leading reformers, that the Secretary should be a man of independent mind, of distinctively practical ability, and open to conviction by the demonstration of facts and tendencies. In the conditions of the debate on Mr. Smith's motion, the concession of a promise of inquiry in any form or degree must be regarded as a very considerable result. If it does not let in the whole hand, it at any rate admits a finger.

What Mr. Samuel Smith demanded was this: "A full and independent Parliamentary inquiry into the condition and wants of the Indian people, and their ability to bear their existing financial burdens; the nature of the revenue system, and the possibility of reductions in the expenditure; also the financial relations between India and the United Kingdom, and generally the system of government in India." Mr. Smith boded a silk gown, and he has got only a sleeve. But it is almost certain that he will get another section of the garment next time, and probably the whole in due course. Mr. Fowler could not be expected, reasonably, to surrender at discretion. Apart from his general argument on the debate, let us look at the points he made against the motion specifically. His stickling at the "independence" of the inquiry bears, of course, no significance. It is not to be denied, however, that there was substance in the objection on the score of wideness of reference. Whether there was sufficient substance to condemn the motion is another question. Mr. Fowler "was sure the House would not sanction referring the constitution of the Government of India to a Select Committee." But, if the Government of India were found in fact to be working unsatisfactorily, why not? It would surely be the most sensible course that the House could take in order to discover the mischief and the remedy. The reference of the British constitution to a Select Committee is a very different matter; for the Government of India is not constantly and directly under the eye of the House. Of course the inquiry demanded by Mr. Smith would be "most protracted and costly." The magnitude of the business would necessarily involve much time and expense. Yet these difficulties were not allowed to stand in the way of action in the time of John Company; and they seem to be very trifling objections at this time of day—that is to say, on the assumption that any inquiry is necessary at all. Mr. Fowler thought, further, that "the results would be most unsatisfactory." If that were so, then undoubtedly his case would be complete. But is Mr. Fowler's forecast at all probable? On what grounds was it based?

"After all," said Mr. Fowler, "any question relating to what I may call the Imperial policy with reference to India must be a question for the responsible Government of the day." To be sure it must. But that does not necessarily imply that the Government of the day is not to take any steps to inform itself of the exact state of facts. The Government, it is true, may rely absolutely on the reports it receives from its agents and officers in India, in the beaten way of official business. But when an immense volume of reputable reports come in from other quarters, charged with opinions wide as the poles asunder from those of the official class, what is the Government to do? It cannot be so ostrich-like as to shut its eyes and ears to the unwelcome sounds and sights. Its duty would seem to prescribe an "independent" inquiry, in order to make sure of the true state of things, and to found thereon—for there can be nothing else whereon to found it safely—a just and sound Imperial policy. Of course, "no Government of the day would shirk that responsibility; no Government of the day would allow any Committee to undertake that responsibility for it; and no House of Commons would allow any Government to shelter itself behind the report of a Committee in dealing with such a question." But, then, the Government cannot possibly make inquiry in person; any Committee inquiring into the facts could not possibly relieve the Government of responsibility for its policy, however much it might lighten that responsibility; and, after all, what is Government responsibility but the chance of being thrown out of office? All this argument is really very painful. Surely the true essence of responsibility lies in the duty to know the very facts, and to frame a policy upon the very facts. The ins and outs of Liberal and Tory Governments are the merest dust in the balance in comparison with the stake now at hazard in the government of India. How is it possible that "a full and independent Parliamentary inquiry" into the facts could prejudice the policy of the Government? Surely there is nothing in this world that could be so helpful to the Government in shaping the policy of England aright.

Apart from verbal quibble, Mr. Smith moved for an inquiry substantially on the lines of the periodical inquiries made during the government of the East India Company. As to the value of these inquiries, there can be no room for difference of opinion. Mr. Fowler said, truly enough in literal fact, that "we are not living under that state of things"—that is to say, where the Parliament was trustee for the Company, and the Company carried on the government of India. India, no doubt, is now under the government of the Imperial Parliament, through a responsible Minister. But, when all this is fully acknowledged, there remains at bottom the essential point of analogy, and that is that Parliament, with all its responsible people, and all the tons of Blue Books and official correspondence, is just as much in need of exact and trustworthy information now as it was when John Company required a renewal of his lease. If Mr. Fowler will but consider how deplorably—and, by reason of the system, inevitably—our representatives in India are out of touch with native feeling and opinion; if he will but dispassionately weigh the evidences of dissatisfaction with the official policy and administration, and with the official representations of the facts of administration and social life, he will hardly fail to acknowledge that there is an irresistible force of solid reason behind Mr. Smith's demand. It is not, indeed, too much to say that the real welfare of India, to say nothing of the comfort and credit of England, requires now an investigation of the full length and breadth of Mr. Smith's motion. It would only be antedating a very short period to affirm that such an inquiry is necessary to the stability and permanence of the Indian empire. The precedents of previous inquiries cited by Mr. Fowler, although freely minimised by him, may not be encouraging in their actual direct outcome. But still they all brought out important points of essential interest; and, after all, the true analogy lies with the periodical overhauls of the East India Company, which were incontestably valuable in the highest degree. The thing is to get down to the bed-rock of facts. What are we to believe, what are we to disbelieve, about the various branches of Indian government and administration in relation to the new and rapid growth of instructed native opinion and the development of national feeling?

Mr Fowler thinks that an inquiry such as Mr. Smith moved for "would create an impression that the Government of India was upon its trial, and would weaken its moral force." The Government of India would certainly be upon its trial. But the Government of India is now upon its trial. More than that, it already stands condemned in the minds of a large proportion of the jury, English as well as Native. Not that any one desires to lead it out to instant execution; but it might be so very much more efficient than it is, so very much less oppressive to the natives, and so very much less harassed, if more closely in unison with the popular sentiment and judgment. Weaken its moral force? There is not a man that is intelligently conscious of its moral force, who would not welcome a thorough inquiry in order that its moral force may be strengthened. To the vast mass of the natives the Sarkar may be an object of undefined superstitious awe; but moral force in that shape is hardly capable of exciting the admiration of the civilised world, however useful it may be temporarily in the lower strata of an undeveloped society. The true operation of moral force is upon the minds of men who have been instructed in the schools of learning and of experience of the world. Now such are the very men whose views of the government and administration of India are voiced by Mr. Smith and his supporters—the natural and inevitable spokesmen of the dumb masses. It seems, therefore, that such an inquiry as is asked for, instead of weakening the moral force of the Government, would indefinitely strengthen it. True, there might be, in the case of some of the Anglo-Indian officials, a certain liability to humiliation; but if the welfare of the country and the Government require measures entailing such results, there can be no help for it, and there need be no regret for it. "The retrospect" of English government and administration in India, as Sir Richard Temple has well said, "must convince every impartial observer that, despite mistakes, failures, short-comings, omissions, there has been much wisdom, courage, justice, and nobleness in the management of affairs; and that, although there have been instances of apathy, remissness, or incapacity, still those on whom the control of the helm devolved have, for the most part, proved to be men of benevolent aspirations, potent energy, and patriotic virtue." The main question at present is concerned with good judgment rather than with good intention, or other excellent personal qualities. The leaders of the natives are quite competent to criticise the administration of their country, and we are bound to meet them on the facts of the case. We dare not shrink from the test they propose, especially on such transcendental grounds as the possibility of shaking superstitious belief in English omniscience and infallibility. In fact, the broad result of a free inquiry would be to demonstrate, in the most practical way, to the natives of India, that their welfare lies very close to the heart of the English Government and people.

The conflict of official and non-official views is so keen that it would be the part of wisdom to determine it as promptly as possible; and the only method of doing so with satisfaction to all interests would seem to be a clear exposition of the facts in issue. To continue mutual recriminations of assertion and denial is merely to maintain a futile combat, fruitful only of bad blood; and meantime the Government of India remains, and is plunged ever deeper, in a bog of discredit. The legitimate aspirations of the natives of India, which we have honourably done our best to encourage, must evidently be permitted to proceed in their natural development; and the sympathetic interest of Englishmen is obviously not to be bounded by official views that are known to be largely, if not even grossly, at variance with the developed thought and feeling of the natives, and that are believed by competent and independent observers to be incompatible either with justice or with safe policy. It is unnecessary to recapitulate here the main points of complaint, with the ineffectual official denials; they have been fully set forth in recent numbers of this journal. There appears to be great reason for satisfaction that Mr. Fowler has gone so far as to concede "a Select Committee which will inquire into the financial expenditure of the Indian revenues, both in England and in India." The precise limits of the concession remain to be defined "at the very commencement of next Session." It must be the strenuous endeavour of the Indian Parliamentary party to have them made as wide as possible; and it is to be hoped that Mr. Fowler will, on reflection, see how extremely important it is that he should meet their wishes with a frank liberality. He admits the fundamental necessity of "clearing up some of the charges of extravagance which have been made against the Government of India," and of "bringing about a more efficient and economical administration in India, and letting the people of India know that for every sovereign spent they get twenty shillings value." So far, so good. And, when all this is accomplished, the Government may be in a position to see how absolutely necessary it is to proceed further on the lines of Mr. Smith's motion. The concession, whatever be the limits fixed, can be accepted only as an instalment. On all the points not conceded the agitation must go on persistently. It will be a matter of deep regret if Mr. Fowler does not courageously seize the grand opportunity that has been placed in his hands. The chance has not yet slipped away.

A. F. MURISON.

THE NEW INVASION OF AFGHANISTAN.

BY AN ANGLO-INDIAN.

Very few of our public men now retain any memory of the first Afghan war; though several now venerable students of modern history still remember the indelible impression made on the public mind by the wicked blunder of 1838-9, followed by its hideous results in the ghastly massacre of Indian troops in the pass of Jagdalak. But the sequence of political errors is inexorable. That disastrous invasion has left its deep traces on the Indian debt, and not a few can trace its bearing on the great revolt of 1857. As to the second invasion of Afghanistan, that is still fresh in the memory of journalists: it should also weigh on the conscience of some few active politicians; and as to the promoters of that treason against the Empire, though they were "found out," they have never yet been personally called to account. In those days of departmental secrecy and parliamentary sophistications those wanton makers of the war against H. H. Shere Ali in 1878—who sinned against light, if ever men did—have been enabled to shuffle off their responsibility, while some of their tools and instruments still unblushingly flaunt their stars and honours before the public gaze. Yet, in the simpler times of "our long island story," there have been politicians of station and rank who have forfeited their heads on Tower Hill for errors or follies more venial than the crimes of those who secretly concocted and recklessly carried out that ugly rush beyond our Indian frontiers in November, 1878. In due sequence, because no personal penalty was exacted and no public inquisition into that scandalous transaction has yet been held, we are now in for a THIRD INVASION of AFGHANISTAN.

This is really the situation, though it is disguised to careless observers by the dailies' head-lines, "Fighting on the Indian Frontier," or "Trouble on the Border"; while the true significance of the present invasion of foreign territory is more skilfully concealed in the demi-official telegrams of the *Times* and Reuter, edited with "intent to deceive." Here and there some journals have had the good sense to avoid the mischievous evasion. For instance, the *Pall Mall Gazette* in giving, about a month ago, that realistic account, by a Punjab cavalry officer, of "hell let loose" by the Waziris in their attack on General Turner's ill-guarded camp at Wano, honestly entitled it the "Fighting in Afghanistan." And the *Westminster Gazette* (November 7th), when summarising the situation from the telegraphic reports, in its paragraph "What the Troops were doing in Waziristan," did give some inkling of the political motive of our new invasion of Afghan territory. In a short letter about a week later, under the same heading, a correspondent gave a comprehensive statement of the schemes of which the Indian Government's "invasion of the Waziri highlands is but the initial step." But the *Gazette* writer, in a later passage of his summary, blindly accepted the whole case of the Simla conspirators, in such remarks as—"the moving forward of Colonel Turner's little army of occupation . . . . was a perfectly justifiable proceeding . . . . in his pacific work." It is fudge of this sort and this wholesale begging of the question, which has been amplified in the *Times* and elsewhere, that too easily misleads the busy and preoccupied British public. Waiving, for the moment, the facts of physical geography and ethnography that underlie the whole subject, those phrases "a perfectly justifiable proceeding" and "a pacific work," conveniently let light into the political schemes and aggressive policy of which this new invasion of Afghan territory is only the outward demonstration. As to the brigadiers of "the little army of occupation"—which with the troops concentrated at Dera-Ismail, Bannu, and Kohat form a tolerably complete army corps—they only obey orders, carrying forward with their "conspicuous gallantry" the plans of irresponsible bureaucratic politicians; and they rightly count on securing decorations or promotion for the survivors. As to poor Macaulay and the rest, they have a soldier's honour, but are out of the reckoning—to say nothing of the equally brave Waziris who (as the *Pall Mall Gazette* reporter says) "met their death fighting to the last gasp," while with our Sikhs and Ghurkas, "every sword was red to the hilt and every lance reeking." But these are only incidents of "every battle of the warrior," notably so in Afghanistan, —as, see, Kipling's "Fore and Aft."

Now, what is there beyond and behind this bloody business, will be asked by the self-respecting British citizen, who is responsible for it all. What is it that makes this invasion a "perfectly justifiable proceeding"? The writer quoted above finds the answer easy, thus: "It is only necessary to recall Sir Mortimer Durand's mission, one of the results of which was that His Highness (the Amír) gave over to us the allegiance of the Waziri Highlanders and other tribes on the Quetta-Peshawar border." Here let our readers note in passing the persistent error in using that little word "on". These transactions are all BEYOND the border; and on the essentially vital difference between those two terms consists, logically, the crux of the whole question. The sentence quoted above is a neatly expressed, but very delusive summary of the political history of the matter. The bearing of this will be more apparent if we quote, from the letter in the same journal, a slightly extended statement, thus:

> "No doubt, under the Kabul-Durand treaty (the text of which is still carefully suppressed) H. H. Abdur Rahman was bullied, bribed, and cajoled to relinquish his suzerainty over the Waziris and other tribes in Eastern Afghanistan; but that diplomatic gerrymandering makes no difference to the rest. . . . . They will perish rather than come unreservedly under British influence, as is the cant phrase of the Simla and India Office conspirators."

Thus it becomes necessary to touch on the unpublished and disguised history of the infatuated policy that has led up to this third invasion of Afghanistan. These schemes were in hand during Lord Dufferin's time—though his lordship was more especially concerned in the invasion of Burma and destruction of its indigenous dynasty. Under Lord Lansdowne's confiding and plastic nominal rule these Afghan schemes were persistently promoted on the west; whilst also, on the north, the supersession of Kashmir and utilisation of its resources were made subservient to the designs of the same Durand brothers in the filibustering raids into the Hindu Kush and High Asia, up to the very foot of the Pamirs. But that is another story; and we are now only concerned with the renewed invasion of Afghanistan on the west. As to the absorption of the Khelat-Beluch territory and the setting up of a "place of arms" at Quetta, with its attendant waste of millions on wretched, ruinous railways through the god-forsaken Beluch mountains, that belongs to the Salisbury-Lytton period of disastrous record. The present field of aggression and barren acquisition is only faintly indicated by the absurdly loose phrase "the Quetta-Peshawar border." Once upon a time, before even Lord Salisbury was beguiled (the powers below only know how) into his later policy of reckless opportunism at the cost of helpless India, he used to advise flighty politicians to "study large maps" by way of moderating their transports. But it is persons of very different order whom we now ask to resort to that sobering course of study. Let them take a survey of eastern Afghanistan and draw a line from Pishin, (and now Chaman) on the south-west, inclining somewhat easterly as it passes up enclosing the already occupied Zhab country; then keep to the west of these Waziri alpine regions where an invading force are now engaged in their "pacific work"; next through the Mohmund hills, the fierce tribes of which are already down on us; then, still going north, take the line a little further west so as to bring in the Kurram and Khast ravines, out of which one division of General Roberts's force was driven by the Mangal tribesmen in January, 1879.[1] Then proceeding northward by the western end of the Khyber Pass, so as to enclose the Afridi and other Pathon "Khels" of sects—whom we just now are keeping quiet with rupees—the line of "influence," inclining somewhat west again, is to take in Bajour, so on to Asmar, and probably even unto Chitral in the Hindu Kush. This last sweep of "delimitation" the Commission was to proceed for through the Kunar ravine on the 12th inst., and was expected to arrive at Asmar about the 16th. It should be noted that the south-west portion of this *enclave* comprises Sivat, also the fastnesses of the Boneirs, and Uzufais, who, at Christmas time, 1863, did their very worst to harass and pursue our retiring expedition of that period. Here, in passing, it may be mentioned that the schemes and intrigues by the Simla Political Department, which have led up to this mad notion of detaching these immense mountain provinces from Kabul, were indicated in outline in two papers which appeared in these columns under date of November, 1891, and August, 1892; though nearly every official document on this purposely obscured subject is persistently withheld from Parliament and the public.

Those who may resort to large maps to follow our Survey will form some conception of the immense

---

[1] "With the Kurram Field Force, 1878-9." By Major J. A. S. Colquhoun, R.A. (W. H. Allen and Co.)

०७८२१९

extent, some thousands of square miles of barren valleys and sterile mountains, over which the Indian Government is vainly attempting to extend its sway. If along with those topographical charts the inquirer place before him a physical map showing the more the alpine altitudes of the ranges through which delimitation Commissions are now being sent, to be followed inevitably by "armies of occupation," such inquirer may form some conception of the monstrous folly to which one department of the Indian Government has been secretly permitted to commit the British empire. The talk about our "frontiers" is sarcastic fudge. These forays are far *beyond* the boundaries of India; and they are carried on in defiance of the wise restrictions embodied in the statute of 1858 by the late Earl of Derby and the statesmen of that period. These regions are as different from India proper as the Alps and Dolamite mountains are from the south-western provinces of France—they are foreign in every respect from India, in climate, in conditions of life, in race, and in every economic factor. What would be thought of the sanity of French statesmen if they had proposed to themselves, by way of guarding against remote possibility of invasion of France by Italy or Austria, to overrun the Alps and the Tyrol, planting camps, arsenals, and armies of occupation in those mountain regions? Yet that conveys only a moderate comparison of the unspeakable folly carried on by the Indian Government during the last eighteen years, unchecked by responsible statesmen of either party at the centre of the Empire. Lord Elgin, in his recent durbar speeches at Quetta and Lahore, used fine phrases put into his mouth by that sane Political Department, the *fons et origo mali* of all this dismal disastrous history; and his lordship had his reward in the eager response of our Jingo journals. But in this Afghan matter, however good his intentions, any Viceroy (no longer a Governor-General) is but a fly on the wheel. Here is a chance for rising statesmen, if there are such in these days of sham "imperialism" Where are the men wise, bold, and strong enough to save the British Empire from the ruin that has been invoked by obscure irresponsible departmental officials? That is *the* Indian question of the day.[1]

AN ANGLO-INDIAN.

THE WOLF AND THE LAMB.

By A. O. Hume, C.B.

THE British Government in India has in the past furnished many striking illustrations of the fable of the wolf and the lamb, but we had fondly believed that the day for such things had passed away for good. News, however, recently received from Madras seems to point to the fact that the Government of that Presidency is contemplating a revival of the bad old times and their unjust practices, and has taken in hand the annexation of the Laccadive Islands. Very few people know anything of these interesting little ocean specks, which constitute the northern half of the chain of coral islets and atols which run almost due north and south down the Indian Ocean from N. lat. 14° to the equator, at an average distance of 100 miles from the west coast of the Indian Peninsula, the southern half constituting the Maldives, with the better known island of Minicoy (on which a P. and O. vessel was wrecked at the end of 1862), standing as the central link of the whole chain.

They are very unimportant places, these Laccadives, the largest, or at any rate most populous, island, Amini Divi, boasting a population of barely 3,000 souls, and the rest of the islands having much fewer inhabitants. But insignificant or not, they do not belong to us, and the attempt which appears to be now making to extort them, by what is virtually a threat, from the hands of their legitimate sovereign is just on a par with many of our previous misdeeds in the East, and, considering the change of tone in national morality that has taken place during the last twenty-five years, inexplicable and indefensible.

Very briefly the facts are these. By a treaty entered into with the East India Company on the 28th October, 1796 (*vide* Aitchison's "Treaties," vol. 5, p. 395), a tribute of Rs. 15,000 was agreed to be paid by the Sultan on account of his sovereignty over the Laccadive Islands and of his property on the mainland. The tribute fell into arrears, owing chiefly to the difficulties thrown in the native ruler's way, and the islands were consequently sequestrated under the following order of the Governor-General of the day:—

Extract from letter from the officiating Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, dated 2nd March, 1876, No. 594 P:

"2. The islands can remain in sequestration until the arrears of tribute are cleared off, and meanwhile the Madras Government should organise and submit for the approval of the Government of India a proper system of fiscal and judicial administration, and it can be intimated to Ali Rajah that the restoration of the islands to the management of himself and his successors will be conditional on his engaging to retain the agency and the system introduced by the British Government.

"3. The grant to Ali Rajah and his successors of a malikana of 20 per cent. on the normal revenue of the said islands is sanctioned for such period as the islands remain in sequestration."

But last June the Collector of Malabar, under the orders of the Madras Government, addressed the following letter to the Sultan Ali, Rajah of Cannanore, the hereditary Sultan of the Laccadives.

---

[1] The above was written before the appearance in the *Times* of December 20th of the Hon. George Curzon's effort in the space of three columns to excuse or account for the vast schemes of trans-frontier absorption, very inadequately described in the limits available. That adventurous traveller but young politician claims to be accepted as an authority on this revolutionary policy, in that he has studied it for "ten years." This only seems to indicate that he is under the fatal disadvantage of approaching the subject under the assumptions and superficial estimates—unchecked by publicity—on which that reactionary and reckless policy has proceeded. Hence he has, possibly unconsciously, become one of its partisans. It must be admitted that his acquaintance with the regions concerned, gained as a well-equipped traveller, has been extensive; but this goes only a small way to qualify him to estimate the military, physical, and political factors involved in these desperate schemes to set up "spheres of influence" on those rugged and remote territories. Besides, Mr. Curzon has not resided in India itself, and has had no opportunity of realising the sense of administrative responsibility. His brief experience at the India Office would, in itself, be a disqualification for estimating the very grave issues comprised in this trans-frontier policy which he essays to defend.

> "CALICUT, 30/5/94.
>
> "Dear Sir,—You are aware that the administration of the Laccadive Islands has been practically taken out of your hands for a good many years past, and that the arrears of peshkash[1] due to Government now amount to a considerable sum. The Government finds that your present nominal sovereignty over them is a bar to the introduction of much-needed reform. Although they are nominally yours, you have no real control over them, nor is it likely that the Government will consent to restore them to you under any circumstances.
>
> "I am therefore directed to consult you as to the terms upon which you would be willing to make the islands over to the Government. Liberal remission of the arrears, now amounting to 35,000 rupees would of course be granted as well as a reduction of peshkash.
>
> "It is unnecessary for me to remind you that your present position as a revenue defaulter is not a very dignified one, and you will probably see the advantage of exchanging a nominal sovereignty for complete freedom from arrears and a tangible reduction in peshkash.
>
> "I am asking the Sub-Collector to see you with a view to coming to an amicable settlement of the matter, and to discuss the terms upon which you would be willing to make over the islands to Government.
>
> "Yours faithfully,
> "(Signed) HERBERT BRADLEY."

Now please mark that the Government of India when they sequestrated the islands (and it is extremely doubtful whether they had anything but "*might*" on their side in this transaction) plainly and explicitly declared that the restoration of the islands to the Sultan and his successors, after the arrears of tribute had been cleared off, would be conditional simply on his engaging to retain the agency and the system introduced by the British Government. The Government had no right, legal or moral, to impose this condition, but still from their point of view such a condition may not have seemed unreasonable, and Ali Rajah, the Sultan never contested nor disputed it. Well, the Government having had the property in hand for eighteen years, has so managed it that the arrears instead of diminishing and being cleared off have increased, and then the collector of Malabar on behalf of the Madras Government, steps in and says to the Sultan:

> "Although they are nominally yours, you have no real control over them, *nor is it likely that the Government will consent to restore them to you under any circumstances.*"

This is quite the traditional "down-West" style:

> "Say, where's that wagon I lent you?"—"That wagon? Waal, I have that wagon now, and I don't part with it nohow, so (laying a revolver on the table) I guess you'd better trade."

Naturally the Rajah did not exactly see it in that light, the more so that the Government had for many years furnished him with *no* accounts of their stewardship, while even the accounts furnished for the first nine years of the occupation were most unsatisfactory and incomplete.

The Rajah's reply to Mr. Bradley puts the several points very clearly:

> "CANNANORE, 9th August, 1894.
>
> "DEAR SIR,—Referring to your letter of the 30th May last, and to our conversation of the 19th July on the subject thereof, I beg to state that in view of the importance of the matter I have had an approximate estimate of my financial position made out, which shows that with economical management, on a reformed basis, I shall be able to liquidate the arrears of peshkash, said now to amount to Rs. 35,000, in the near future.
>
> "2. It is a painful surprise to me to find in your letter that my sovereignty over the Laccadive Islands, which you have been pleased to characterise as nominal, has been a bar to the introduction of much-needed reforms; and what is more painful is the sudden warning that it is unlikely that the Government will consent to restore them to me under any circumstances.
>
> "3. So far as I am aware, I have not in any way, directly or indirectly stood in the way of Government introducing any reforms in the Islands, and I shall be glad to know the circumstances which have led you to the conclusion that my sovereignty is a bar to improvements.
>
> "4. I can hardly bring myself to believe that the Government will ever wish to add to their vast possessions by depriving me of my sovereignty over the Laccadives, especially when regard is had to the fact that I am second to none in my loyalty and allegiance to the British Raj. Compared to the territory under the British Government, the Laccadives are in extent a mere drop in the ocean. To deprive me of the Islands will, I submit, be in keeping neither with the declared policy of Government nor with the benign sentiments expressed by the Government of India when the Islands were sequestered.
>
> "I regret to have to inform you that I have not had any accounts of the Receipts and Charges of the Islands since Fasli 1294 (July, 1884, to June, 1885). Of course the accounts furnished from Fasli 1285 to 1294 leave much to be desired in respect of details which will be made the subject of a separate communication in due course. Meanwhile I beg you will be good enough to direct that the accounts due, and promised in your letter No. $\frac{1994\text{P.}}{\text{Gl.}}$ dated the 23rd September, 1892, be furnished to me at an early date. I regret and apologise for the delay in this letter, which was unavoidable.
>
> "I remain, Dear Sir, yours faithfully,
> "(Sd.) ALI RAJAH OF CANNANORE.
>
> "H. Bradley, Esq.,
> "Ag. Collector of Malabar."

We are informed, but we hope that it is not true, that despite the Sultan's protest, the Madras Government have urged the Government of India and the Secretary of State to take over the islands, and the report in Madras is that the Secretary of State is disposed to view Lord Wenlock's recommendation favourably. All this latter may be more or less inaccurate, but the main portion of the case shows in what an unprincipled and immoral manner responsible Government officials in India are prepared to set to work to "best" the unfortunate native chiefs who are hopelessly at their mercy. There is scarcely a native prince in India who could not produce similar instances of tyrannous official pressure, to bring about results that Government desires, but has no title to claim under treaty. But no native chief dares to produce the evidence of these misdeeds, and unless by some chapter of accidents it falls, as in the present case, into outside hands, the public never knows or hears of it, until too many years have passed to render the righting of the wrong practicable.

---

[1] *Anglice*, "tribute."

Let it be clearly understood that we do not assert that it may not be best on the whole for the British Government to acquire the sovereignty of the Laccadives. But even if it be so, let the Sultan be approached openly, and, without any threats, offered a really handsome price for his property; a price to cover not only a full capitalized value of all the revenue he ever could derive therefrom under the long established (and, to the people, perfectly satisfactory) administration that obtained prior to our inter-meddling, but also the great loss in dignity, so dear to Indian hearts, involved in the surrender of an old sovereignty.

Let it, however, be borne in mind that (1) The Rajah does not wish it. (2) The islanders, whatever under official threats and pressure they may be made to say, do not wish it. And (3) the islands are far too poor to bear the expense of an administration of the British type. The islands grow practically no grain, though there are a *bigah* or two of made agricultural land in Amini. They have in abundance, fish, turtles, and cocoanuts, and some bread-fruit trees, guavas, plantains, etc., but the bulk of their farinaceous food and clothing, or yarn, has to come from the mainland, to which they send yearly their matchless *coir*, *kopra* (the dried cocoanut), cocoanuts, turtle shell, and shells, getting in exchange at Mangalore, etc., rice and some other grains, cloth, and yarn. The island fleet goes up with one monsoon, and down with the next one. The people are very poor, but on the whole were happier and more comfortable under the Rajah's rule than most of the Indian rayats under British rule. Each island had its own primitive local administration—the people managed their own affairs and managed them well. The Rajah had a representative in some of the islands, he levied certain well understood time sanctioned dues, but except in the case of serious crimes, which were exceptionally rare, interfered little with the local headmen, approved by the people. We who write have ourselves visited most of the islands and spent nearly a month amongst them, discussing face to face with the people, through the medium of a Madras interpreter (an educated man, who spoke English and Malayalum, the language spoken on the islands, fluently), all the conditions and circumstances of their lives, and, but for one single point, we should unhesitatingly say, leave the islands to the Sultan to govern in the old fashioned way and don't go forcing there your cut-and-dried, expensive, cast-iron, unsympathetic, bureaucratic rule. First make your rayats on the mainland happy and contented, and *then* it will be time enough to think of interfering with the islanders.

The one point that makes us doubtful is this. About three or four times in a century, the whole or the greater portion of the island fleet, gets caught in a bad storm going up or returning, and is lost. Then unless relief on a large scale is promptly sent from the mainland, the islanders must suffer greatly. We do not mean that they will actually starve, for with cocoanuts, fish, shellfish, turtle, eked out by bird's eggs from the Piti and other banks, at one season, and such little bread fruit, plantains, etc., as they have got to grow, at another, they get along somehow, though a good many die. But they need not only food stuff, rice, and grains, and cloth, but new boats or wood to build these, which the islands do not bear, and altogether to set them on their legs after such a calamity needs an expenditure far beyond the means of the Sultan. So that, perhaps, despite the disadvantages of British rule, on the whole the people might be better off for a change of sovereigns, and though this will cost us money, it may be a desirable charity, though the people themselves will never think so, except just at the time when we come to their rescue with specially chartered steamers, loaded with food stuffs, wood planks, iron, mast poles, and materials for clothing.

But whether it be deemed best to take them or not, at any rate let us not do evil that good may come—let us not inaugurate a professed benevolence to the people by driving a hard bargain with the ruler about his sovereignty under the threat that we have hold of it now and do not intend "under any circumstances to restore it;" above all, do not let us persist in keeping alive in the hearts of all Indian princes the conviction forced upon them by our faithlessness in the past, that the British Government makes treaties to suit its own interests, sticks to these treaties to the letter where this is to its own advantage, but wherever and whenever it suits its purposes treats them as waste paper, and tramples on the rights of all it no longer needs, or who have become too feeble to resist its wrongdoing.

A. O. HUME.

THE CANTONMENTS QUESTION.

BY PROFESSOR J. STUART, M.P.

There is a certain group of supporters of the C.D. Acts—sorry defenders of a lost cause—who every now and then try to get up a rumour that the Service is going to the dogs, that venereal diseases are increasing because of the Repeal of these Acts, and that the one remedy and the certain remedy is to re-enact them. These people generally add that such is the view of official England; and then this ridiculous statement billows over the continent of Europe as well as over England in mysterious little newspaper paragraphs sedulously communicated from headquarters, till the billow breaks on the solid rock of fact.

There has lately been such a wave of misrepresentation. It is well, therefore, that it should be broken by a piece of fact. That piece of fact can now be presented to the readers of INDIA. The Report on Sanitary Measures in India 1892-93 has just been published. It is accompanied as usual by a memorandum of the Army Sanitary Commission, the highest official sanitary authority in the British Army. The following paragraph relating to venereal diseases occurs in that Report, and I make no apology for quoting the whole of the paragraph:—

> "Next to malarial fevers, venereal diseases continued to be the main cause of inefficiency in the European army as a whole. In Bengal, and in Bombay, also, this was the case, but in Madras they occupy the first place, and account for 415 cases

per 1,000, the proportion contributed by malarial fevers being only 239. For the last five years the general venereal ratios for the European army of India stand thus per 1,000 of strength :—

1888	370·6
1889	418·5
1890	503·5
1891	400·7
1892	409·9

The ratio for 1892 shows an increase of 9 cases per 1,000 over 1891, but the rate for 1891, it will be observed, was over 100 per 1,000 less than it was in 1890. Still, even with this diminution as compared with 1890, it admits of no question that in 1892 venereal diseases prevailed among European soldiers in India to such an extent as to constitute a most serious cause of inefficiency. In a seperate memorandum which we submitted in December, 1893, we discussed this question at some length, and gave the reasons why we arrived at the conclusion that the evil had been very slightly mitigated in India under the lock hospital system, and that the reintroduction of this system on sanitary grounds could not be recommended. We need not pursue the subject further now, but it may be useful to reproduce here a statement which was appended to that memorandum, showing the statistics of venereal disease among the men serving in the United Kingdom for the six years during which the Contagious Diseases Acts were more or less in force, and the next six years when they had ceased to be in operation, and from which it will be seen that the ratio of admissions per 1,000 has decreased since the Acts were abolished :—

TABLE showing the ADMISSION and CONSTANTLY SICK RATES for VENEREAL AFFECTIONS in the UNITED KINGDOM during the twelve years 1881 - 92.

Year.	Ratio per 1,000.		Remarks.
	Admitted.	Constantly sick.	
1881....	245·5	16·67	Contagious Diseases Acts in force.
1882....	246·0	16·86	
1883....	260·0	18·54	Contagious Diseases Acts partially repealed in May.
1884....	270·7	20·14	
1885....	275·4	19·34	
1886....	267·1	19·29	Contagious Diseases Acts repealed in March.
1887....	252·9	19·10	
1888....	224·5	18·19	
1889....	212·1	16·96	
1890....	212·4	17·07	
1891....	197·4	15·34	
1892....	201·2	16·46	

These figures suffice to show how very little influence the Acts could have had in diminishing venereal disease, under conditions more favourable to their operations than those which exist in India."

Comment on this exceedingly important utterance is wholly unnecessary. It is perhaps the most absolute and complete vindication which it is possible to have of the attitude taken up by Repealers and thoroughly endorsed by the repeated votes of the British House of Commons.

JAMES STUART.

In India taken as a whole there is, according to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, "no public opinion in the sense in which we use the term in England. The natives of India are not, and never have been, and are never likely to be, politicians."

THE DISINTEGRATING EFFECTS OF ENGLISH LAW COURTS ON INDIAN SOCIETY.

BY PARBATI C. ROY, B.A.[1]

The Indians are a poor people, much poorer than can be imagined by Englishmen. The majority of them do not earn more than twopence a day. They live mostly by agriculture. Their civilisation is cast in an altogether different mould from that of the English, being more spiritual than material. Their society was still in its primitive simplicity when the English first found them. They had a system of local self-government which existed when the Greeks visited India more than two thousand years ago, and which continued to exist till the commencement of the present century.

> "The village communities," said Sir Charles Metcalf, "are little republics having nearly everything they can want within themselves and almost independent of any foreign relations. They seem to last where nothing else lasts."[2]

> "Each township," wrote Mr. Elphinstone, "conducts its own internal affairs. It manages its police, and is answerable for any property plundered within its limits. It administers justice to its own members as far as punishing small offences and deciding disputes in the first instance."[3]

According to another contemporary historian :

> "Incompatible as such a state of things must be . . . . with the feelings and principles of Europeans, its effects upon the conditions of the inhabitants of India were not wholly subversive of their happiness. The persons placed over them belonged to themselves, were assimilated in religion and language, conversant with their usages ; and not regardless of their good opinion. Their decisions, although not guided by a code of laws, were founded upon an accurate knowledge of persons and things ; and, when not distorted by sinister influences, were commonly conformable to equity and good sense. The proceedings of the self-constituted courts were simple, and their sentences summary ; they were not embarrassed or retarded by complicated forms and technical pleadings ; and the people escaped the tax upon their money and time which more elaborate judicature imposes. Another advantage contributed to counteract the defects of the system. In the absence of courts of justice provided by the State the people learned to abstain from litigation ; and when disputes among them arose submitted them to the arbitrament of judges chosen among themselves."[4]

But these "self-constituted courts" were superseded by regular courts of justice under the regulations of 1793.

> "Everyone who had, or fancied he had, a wrong to redress resorted to the courts ; and the numbers of the suitors speedily became so numerous that the means of hearing and adjudicating their cases were wholly insufficient. . . . . Reference to the regulations of the government, and to the written authorities of Hindu and Muhammadan law, retarded decision ; and the multiplication of opportunities of appeal from one tribunal to another encouraged and perpetuated litigation."[5] . . . . . "It seems also to have been forgotten that for centuries prior to the introduction of European agency law and justice had been administered solely by natives; yet society had been held

---

[1] Late Police Magistrate, Alipur, Calcutta; late Subordinate Judge and Small Cause Court Judge, Darjiling; late Divisional Settlement Officer, Chutia-Nagpur ; and late Superintendent of Dearah Surveys and Settlements in Eastern Bengal.

[2] "Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, 1832," vol. iii, appendix 84, p. 331.

[3] Elphinstone's "History of India" (5th edition), p. 68.

[4] Horace Hayman Wilson's "History of British India from 1805 to 1835," vol. i, p. 388.

[5] *Ibid*, vol. i., p. 390.

together, and there had been times when, according to the testimony of travellers and historians, India had been populous and flourishing, the people thriving and happy.”[1]

The most important effect of the introduction of English laws and law courts has been that the money-lenders have prospered at the expense of the poor rayats. This has more than once been admitted by Government, as will appear from the following:

> “It appears from the report (presented to Parliament) of the Commission that the disturbances in question (in Bombay) arose out of the relations of the agricultural and money-lending classes. . . . The first important change under our rule which affected the question of indebtedness was the establishment of civil courts for the recovery of debt. The facilities they afforded for the purpose had the effect of expanding the rayat's credit to a most hurtful extent, and of bringing into existence a host of low-class money-lenders, whose dealings were most pernicious to the community. The aid given by the courts, said Mr. Inverarity in 1858, ‘is all on the side of the Marwari (professional money-lender), who alone knows how to turn that aid to his advantage. The position of the litigants is not, therefore, simply of debtors and creditors, it is the fraudulent Marwari, backed by civil courts, *versus* the helpless rayat signing any bond without even a true knowledge of its contents, and powerless to oppose any decree that may be passed.’”[2]

> “The Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal expresses a fear that the tendency to uphold doctrines of bare law, the literal enforcements of contracts alleged to have been entered into by ignorant and improvident people, lead to a hard measure in cases which affect poor men and reduce them to slavery or drive them to despair. Every case against a poor man may be a rule to lead to the subjection of a hundred other poor men; and such a system is a great advantage to the rich and litigious. Cases are the subjects of an amount of litigious power which, Sir George Campbell believes, is unprecedented in every other country in the world. The general use of that lawyer power in stage after stage, process after process, appeal after appeal, and suit after suit, is enormous. People are often driven to despair. . . . . Among the Sonthals the civil procedure code was introduced, and worked such mischief that the position became dangerous. The people were exasperated, and they have been removed from the operation of the laws which are applicable generally in Bengal.”[3]

> “In Oudh the number of civil suits has doubled in four years; and the reports observe that, under our rule there is a progressive proneness to civil litigation. The sales of houses and lands bear a large proportion to the total number of processes and in many cases there is a failure to realise the amount decreed against the debtor because he is absolutely devoid of means, already wrung dry. In the Central Provinces, litigation increases from year to year which is considered to be a sign of great indebtedness and poverty of the people. The suits are generally for money on written promises to pay and on very small sums. It is the general impression that the courts are merely used for the purpose of coercing debtors to enter into new engagements on less favourable terms. The principal is never paid off but the interest is mercilessly exacted and the people become slaves to the money-lenders, the most wretched and degraded form of slavery.”[4]

Besides giving expression in the above terms to the condemnation of its own policy, the Government has done nothing to improve the state of things. In 1872, when it deplored the growing evils of litigation, there were instituted in the Civil and Revenue Courts of Bengal, North-West Provinces, and Oudh, Punjab, Madras, and Bombay, 299,185, 160,142, 217,971, 226,321, and 194,899 suits respectively.[1] In 1891 these suits rose up to 630,877 (Bengal), 307,282 (North-West Provinces and Oudh), 301,662 (Punjab), 314,159 (Madras), and 229,893 (Bombay).[2] It will be seen that the increase has been general and enormous. Owing, however, to differences in the rent laws of the several provinces the ratios of increase have not been equally great in all the cases. In Bengal and North-West Provinces and Oudh, where a landlord has to go to court for every rupee of rent due, the increase has been cent. per cent. In Madras, where Government, occupying the place of landlord, realises the revenue by the issue of distress and sale warrants, the increase has been about forty per cent. But as there were 182,940 distress warrants issued by Government for the realisation of revenue in 1891, the actual number of institutions may be taken as (311,195 + 182,940 =) 494,135. No comparison can be made in the case of the Punjab and Bombay, as no such returns are available regarding those provinces which are under special rent laws.

A most noticeable fact in the administration of civil and revenue justice in India is the very large proportion of cases for claims under ten rupees (=12s. nearly). In 1891 the number of such petty suits formed a sixth in Bengal (103,151),[3] a fourth in North-West Provinces and Oudh (81,324),[4] a fifth in Punjab (58,804),[5] a fifth in Madras (58,270),[6] a seventh in Bombay (30,943)[7] of the entire number of suits instituted. In former days almost all claims for money were disposed of by the “self-constituted” village courts. Under the English rule nothing is settled in the village, but every claim is taken up to the Government Court of Justice, the effect of which is that the whole internal social organisation has been broken into pieces, and the descendants of the Indians, whom the Greeks described “as so reasonable as never to have recourse to a law suit,”[8] and “who were never known to tell an untruth,”[8] are now branded as most litigious and untruthful. The village communities survived all the changes of government previous to the advent of the English. But the destructive influence of the British rule has been too much for them to survive. Everything Indian is disappearing under this influence, and as the masses of India are too poor and too ignorant to benefit to the desired extent by the introduction of English institutions the consequence is that the good done is more than counterbalanced by the evil.

Litigation has become so widespread that the English courts more than pay their expenses. In 1884-85 “the sale of court fee stamps realised very

---

[1] *Ibid*, vol. i., p. 393.

[2] “Statement of the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India for 1876-77,” p. 30.

[3] *Ibid*, 1871-72, p. 111.

[4] “Statement of the Moral and Material progress and Condition of India during the year 1871-72 p. 111.

---

[1] “Statistical Abstract Relating to British India,” No. 16, p. 148-50.

[2] *Ibid.*, No. 27, pp. 46-47.

[3] “Bengal Administration Report for 1891-92,” B. Judicial Statement No. 8.

[4] “North-West Provinces and Oudh Administrative Report for 1891-2,” B. Judicial Statement.

[5] “Punjab Administrative Report for 1891-2,” Judicial Statement No. 20.

[6] “Madras Administration Report for 1891-2,” Part II, p. 48.

[7] “Bombay Administration Report for 1891-92,” E. Judicial Statement No. 2.

[8] Elphinstone's “History of India” (5th edition), p. 266.

nearly Rs. 25,000,000. The whole expenditure incurred by the Government for law and justice was scarcely in excess of Rs. 33,000,000, of which over Rs. 7,500,000 represented the cost of gaols and convict stations, and nearly Rs. 9,000,000 the cost of criminal courts. Thus it appears that civil suitors in India fully paid, and in some provinces much more than fully paid, for the costs of all the courts and establishments necessary for dispensing justice."[1] In 1891 the receipts from court fee stamps rose to Rs. 42,621,560,[2] and as the expenditure under the head "Law and Justice" for that year was only Rs. 37,397,390,[3] Government had a clear profit of more than Rs. 15,000,000 from law courts, after paying not only the expenses of those courts, but also the expenses of convict stations and gaols. If the progress of litigation continues at its present rate there is no reason to doubt that the administration of justice will prove a very paying business in the hands of Government. Under the Hindu Rajas and the Muhammadan rulers justice was not taxed at all, but under the English it has become a fruitful source of revenue.

PARBATI C. ROY.

THE SEVENTH PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT.

We take the following passages from the Presidential Address delivered by Mr. Javerilal U. Yajnik at the Seventh Provincial Conference, held at Bombay in November last. References are made to the Address in "Indiana."

INTERPELLATIONS.

On the subject of interpellations in the Bombay Legislative Council, Mr. Javerilal said:—The interpellations have evoked a good deal of criticism outside the Council Hall. Certain critics in our midst have nicknamed our legislative body as an "Interpellative Council." But I fail to see the justice of such an appellation. For what is the chief function of non-official members if not interpellation? It must be remembered that, under the rules laid down by the Governor-General in Council, the scope of questions is limited only to public affairs with which the Government of the Presidency is officially connected or to matters or branches of administration under its control and for which it is responsible. As to matters which are, or have been, the subject of controversy between the Governor-General in Council or the Secretary of State and the Government of Bombay, no questions may be asked or answered except as to matters of fact. The large number of questions which were put at the recent autumn session of the Council has in some quarters been the subject of adverse comment. The number would certainly be less if the Council meetings had been more frequent. What is, however, really felt as a disadvantage to the public in regard to interpellations is that the honorable member who puts a question has no opportunity allowed him of making his object clear by way of a few prefatory remarks, so as to enable the Government to thoroughly apprehend his point of view. Nor is he permitted to say how far the answer fails to meet the query put by him. The result very often is that the replies are either vague or evasive. At any rate the public is seldom the wiser or better for the replies given. In spite of these drawbacks, however, there can be no doubt whatever of the fact that this privilege of interpellation is most valuable. It is a tolerably wholesome check on official vagaries, and acts as a powerful corrective against mal-administration and favouritism. The knowledge that an unfair act on the part of the administration, either in the districts or at headquarters, will be dragged into the light of day, cannot but operate as a powerful antidote against abuses in an official-ridden country like India, with public opinion not so strong or keen as one might expect.

HOW TO ENFORCE ECONOMY.

In Mr. Javerilal's opinion the most urgent Indian problem of the day is, how to touch the economic conscience of the Government in India and England so as to enforce economy in expenditure and prevent increase in public burdens:—Three remedies may be suggested as offering some solution. The first is that the British Government should guarantee the Indian debt; the second is that the Supreme and Provincial Councils should have the right conceded to them of voting on the Budgets; while the third remedy is that India should be treated, not on the footing of a dependency, but on that of a Crown colony. The guarantee of the Indian debt by England would enlist the sympathy of the English taxpayer, and his voice would be a potent factor in ensuring economy. In regard to the second remedy, it is not proposed to alter the constitution of the present Imperial and Provincial Councils. It is not intended to disturb the present number of seats in these Councils. The official majority will continue, as at present, decisively preponderant. All that is proposed is that members may have the right of voting on items when the Budget discussions come on. Generally the official votes will preponderate and the non-officials will be in a minority, but there might be cases, similar to the one which occurred last year about the cotton duties, in which the officials who could not vote according to their conscience, could do so with freedom. The votes recorded will at all events indicate the preponderance of opinion on one or other side of a question. This preponderance will generally be on the official side, but the recording of votes will be an indication to the people at large of the economic conscience of our rulers. The public will know how to appraise the value of these votes at their proper worth. The concession here demanded is but a natural and legitimate development of the principle of self-government. It is only in this way, I say, that we can touch the conscience of our rulers. The proposal about treating India as a Crown colony has this in its favour—that, as in the case of other colonies, the cost of the India Office and a portion of the Indian military expenditure in England, which at present falls on India, would have to be borne by England. Indian expenditure so far would figure in the English Budget, and in that way Indian questions would prick the conscience of the English taxpayer.

---

[1] "Statement of Moral and Material Progress of India for 1884-85," p. 15.

[2] "Statistical Abstract Relating to British India." No. 27, p. 100.

[3] *Ibid*, No. 27, p. 90.

THE DECCAN RELIEF ACT.

Commenting on the Bill for the Amendment of the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act, Mr. Javerilal said:—It is a fact, as the Sabha points out, that the existing Act gives full authority to the Local Government to extend the provisions of the Act to any district in the Presidency with the previous sanction of the Governor-General in Council. But it is urged that the "physical and agricultural condition of various talukas in the same district differs greatly," and as the Government of Bombay desire to extend the Act only to those areas where it may be really needed, an amendment of the Act becomes necessary. The force of this contention is not denied, but this is a very insignificant matter compared to the graver question of how best to deal with the growing agricultural indebtedness on which the late Viceroy has expressed himself so strongly and in no uncertain sound. When the Amendment Bill comes on for consideration before the Supreme Legislature, I am sure our honourable friends, the non-official members, will want to know definitely what opinions the ex-Viceroy has left on record. His views must doubtless have been based on the evidence of the expert witnesses examined by the Commission. Strange as it may appear, this expert evidence is not to be found in the report of the Commission. Appendix I of the report indeed gives abstracts of the evidence taken by the Commission whilst on tour in the Poona, Ahmednagar, Sholapur, and Satara Districts. But the evidence of the expert witnesses, such as the District Judges, the Assistant Judge, the Special Judge and his subordinates, whose names are given in Appendix II of the evidence, is not given in the report. When it is considered that it was on this expert evidence that the Commission based its recommendations, and on which the ex-Viceroy relied in recording his important minute, that it is this evidence to which the public in India would look for forming its opinion as to whether executive reforms are more needed than civil legislation in dealing with the complicated problem of agricultural indebtedness, some idea may be formed of the necessity of placing such evidence before the world. I notice that Sir William Wedderburn moved the Secretary of State for a return of this expert evidence, but so far it has not been forthcoming. It will be to some purpose if some honourable non-official member of the Supreme Council moves for these papers before the Council proceeds to consider the amendment of the Deccan Relief Acts.

THE VERNACULAR PRESS.

Replying to Sir Charles Elliott's attack upon the vernacular press in India, Mr. Javerilal said:—No reasonable man can say that the vernacular press is free from fault. It has its temptations to exaggerated and sensational writing. At the same time it cannot be maintained that this characteristic is the monopoly of that press. The vernacular press is a product of British rule. Journalism in India had no existence before the advent of the British rule. The power of the press for good or evil is immense. Moderation and sobriety of judgment are what one would expect the press to promote. The Indian journalist, however, follows the methods and tactics of his Anglo-Indian brother, and in trying to copy his virtues imitates at times his vices also. Bearing this in mind, Anglo-Indian journals incur no small responsibility as exponents of public opinion on Government measures and public policy. It does not promote a harmony of feeling by the pot calling the kettle black, and though the sermons of the pot to the kettle are often edifying in themselves, there are times when the coolest head and the soundest judgment are needed in helping the public to view burning questions correctly and impartially. Sensational articles and exaggerated reports of passing events appearing in Anglo-Indian journals do incalculable mischief to the people of India. The Anglo-Indian, be he a merchant, a doctor, an engineer, or a civilian in a remote part of the country, often takes his notions of things Indian from the newspapers. (Cheers.) He cannot be expected to verify the statements of the editor. Similarly, Anglo-Indian opinion is communicated to the leading English journals, and through them is circulated to the whole provincial English press in Great Britain. When the Anglo-Indian journals put our case impartially before the Indian and the British public our cause stands a chance of being half won. But if the nerves of the newspaper-reading public in India first and in England afterwards are played upon by some of them through exaggerated and sensational articles, you may well conceive the mischief they have the power to do. My surprise is that the British public so far has not formed a low and mean estimate of the loyalty and moral fibre of the educated classes as one would fear it might otherwise have been led to do under the influence of sensational literature constantly dished up in some Anglo-Indian newspapers. We may implore such writers not to permit their heavy artillery to bear on our inter-sectional or inter-racial interests, and if, while bringing to light our faults, they appreciate what there is of good points in us, the vernacular press will, I am firmly convinced, reciprocate the good feeling. In this way a harmony of feeling, so conducive to public interests, will be brought about.

RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCES IN INDIA.

Referring to the recent "religious" riots in India, Mr. Javerilal said:—Meeting as we do to-day in this busy city of Bombay as representatives of the educated classes from all parts of the Presidency, we have no room here for class and race feelings and differences. (Hear, hear.) Hindus and Muhammadans, Parsis and Christians, all join on this platform whose chief plank is one of fellowship bred in mutual sympathy and respect, and in a desire to promote our common, and not sectional, interests. (Cheers.) In all times and in all places, ignorance and bigotry, pride and prejudice go together, and there are some disorderly spirits in the lower strata of all communities, who sometimes rise to the surface, and, in the name of religion, seek to dissolve the holiest bond of all religions—that which joins man with man in mutual responsibility and helpfulness. Notwithstanding such momentary lapses into fits of insanity, the general good sense of the Indian community soon asserts itself and prevails in the end, for our people have always been distinguished for their freedom from religious fanaticism and the fury of political partisanship. (Cheers.) Their leaders have never attached undue importance to trifling matters, and have always been ready and willing to persuade their own communities that union is strength; and mutual alienation a deadly sin. Religious riots have, no doubt, been frequent of late years in many parts of the country, and it is a question which has baffled the highest statesmanship to understand the genesis of this unusual bitterness. Some have attributed it to a wave of fanaticism which, they think, has swept over the land. Others have, with equal ingenuity, attributed this untoward state of things to influences from without, which are supposed to be hostile to the Congress and which, it is alleged, give encouragement to these dissensions among the people for political and party purposes. On behalf of this Conference and the native community generally, I repudiate both these explanations, especially the last, as being based on very insufficient data, and untenable in the larger light of our intimate knowledge of current history. (Cheers.) The unrest we deplore is, I feel firmly convinced, not the result of any fanaticism or statecraft. The British rulers of this country have at heart the same interests that we cherish as our dearest possessions—the interests of order and peace, progress and co-operation. The noble Queen-Empress who rules over the land has the same motherly regard for all her children without distinction of creed or colour, and the nobler race of which she is the Queen will never falsify its past history by seeking to disunite what the highest statesmanship has joined together. (Cheers.) His Excellency the Governor the other day eloquently justified this noble attitude of official neutrality in matters of religion. It would certainly have been equally satisfactory if His Excellency, in his speech at Ahmednagar, had not singled out a particular community for an expression of his high displeasure. The Maratha community not long ago ruled, and still rules, over a wide stretch of territory inhabited by all manner of races and creeds, where no riots have yet occurred, and its representatives in the Deccan and elsewhere have certainly not lost their heads completely. (Cheers.) His Excellency himself, in his Satara address, made amends for this momentary disturbance of his usual equanimity of temper, and we may well afford to forget these incidents. The inability of the police and district authorities to comprehend the real nature of these occasional outbursts of temper on the part of the lower orders of the Hindu and Muhammadan communities is, however, a fact which we cannot pass over in silence. Stern repression, and not timely prevention, has been their stock remedy for the disease, and this has been the source of much bitterness on both sides. (Hear, hear.) These apparently strained relations are really due to the increasing consciousness of their social rights which the lower orders of both the communities are slowly realising under the protection of British rule. People who were in old times debarred from the exercise of certain privileges seek the help of the law, and, in the course of this self-assertion, it is but natural that certain classes of Hindus and Muhammadans should come into occasional conflict. Gentle management and a spirit of moderation and compromise will surely be of more practical account than indiscriminate punishments for such a state of things. (Hear, hear.) The leaders of both sides are willing to co-operate in a spirit of mutual conciliation if properly approached, and the executive authorities in the lower grades cannot be better employed than in bringing these leaders together and giving strength and stability to their wise counsels.

COTTON GOODS AND IMPORT DUTY.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

Writing on December 18th, the *Daily News* said: The Government have taken the course so often recommended in this journal with reference to the Indian duties on cotton goods. Lord Elgin and his advisers pressed for a general increase in the duties on imports for the legitimate purpose of raising the revenue. In the case of cotton, the Secretary of State refused his assent, because the tax would be protective, and would subject the cotton trade of Lancashire to an unfair disadvantage. That was a perfectly sound argument, and all the talk about ignominious submission to pressure from Lancashire is the merest moonshine. Free Trade is the settled policy of this country, from which no departure can be allowed. Lancashire is not permitted to have Protection against India, and India cannot be permitted to have Protection against Lancashire. The analogy of the self-governing Colonies is not to the point. The Colonies have been granted fiscal independence, and liberty to do right implies liberty to do wrong. Lord Ripon is no more responsible for the Canadian tariff than he is for the tariff of the United States. But India is not self-governing, and Mr. Fowler's responsibility to the House of Commons for Indian administration is absolute. We pointed out, however, last spring that there was a way out of the difficulty, and that way Mr. Fowler has adopted. The import duty will be imposed, and India will get the money. But at the same time there will be a countervailing excise upon Indian cotton, so that Lancashire will not be injured. The excise duties will only be levied upon those qualities of cotton with which England competes, and thus the economic equilibrium will be maintained. Mr. Fowler is to be congratulated upon having taken the sensible course, and upon consulting the needs of India without impairing the commercial interests of the Empire.

The *Daily Chronicle* wrote (December 18th): We are glad to see that the obnoxious exemption of cotton goods from import duty in India is on the point of being remedied. . . . . Even now the introduction of another Bill for the levy of a countervailing excise unhappily modifies the satisfaction consequent upon a tardy act of justice. A duty of five per cent., we are told, will be levied on all yarns of higher count than twenty (with power to raise the limit, conditionally, to twenty-four); that is to say, on all Indian cotton goods that enter into direct competition with those imported from the United Kingdom. The cotton manufactures of India are of coarser quality than ours, and it was calculated for 1893 that only some six per cent. of the whole production of the Indian mills would come into a competition with Lancashire. It is such a trifling matter to make vexation with. Will the results pay for the the printing and stationery and labour necessary for collecting the tax? It would seem that handlooms are to be exempt—almost of necessity. The duty is to be levied by assessment based upon the monthly returns received from manufacturing mills. But we cannot put this excise duty on the product of manufactories in native States, and it is very unlikely that we shall establish frontier customs posts; but there is room for much trouble on this aspect of the case. For one thing, to use Mr. Westland's words, "we obviously protect a foreign industry against our own, besides raising all sorts of difficulties in the matter of granting drawbacks when native manufactures are exported from British ports." It is a ridiculous complication in view of the practical objects to be attained.

The *Times* said (December 17th):—There is much to be said in favour of the proposed import duty. It will not be oppressive to the consumer, for it will be levied entirely on a class of goods which the poorer part of the population do not use. Protective it will not be. The countervailing duty will prevent the possibility of this. For the same reason, too, it will not operate injuriously to the trade of Lancashire, since there will be a fair field and no favour for either native or imported cottons, and it is not likely that the slight addition which it will cause to prices will do much, if anything, to discourage consumption and to reduce the effective demand. But more important than any of these considerations is the fact that this duty has been asked for by the general voice of India and of those who speak for India, that it has been resented as a grievous wrong that the power to impose it has been withheld, and that the discontent of the country has been restrained only by the confidence felt that this wrong would be righted and that justice would at length be done. That we hold India by the sword is true indeed, but it is a part only of the truth. We hold it because the natives know that it is in their interest that our rule is maintained. They trust us to keep faith with them, and to do what our promised regard for their interest involves. This trust is our surest bulwark, and armed or unarmed we should be left weak and defenceless if this were shaken or destroyed.

The *Manchester Guardian* (December 18th) contended that "a protective encouragement" would be "given to the trade in the untaxed productions of India," and added:—The worst of the matter is that the retrograde step now to be taken can be no solution of the difficulty. It can only be a momentary palliative of the immediate financial emergency of the present Finance Minister of India. It may not even be that, for any estimate of the net revenue which the duties will yield when the costs of collection are deducted and the possible effects on trade are taken into account can only be a matter of guess-work. Mr. O'Conor, the Assistant Finance Secretary of the Government of India, showed in an able memorandum published as recently as March last, when he defended the exemption of cotton yarns and fabrics from duty, that, to quote his own words, "to tax cotton manufactures for the sake of revenue only would cause great trouble and inconvenience, with no adequate result; that to tax them for protective purposes would be disastrous; and that to tax them in view to obtaining revenue, and at the same time securing protection, would be silly." There is nothing in the measure to arrest the decline of exchange or the appreciation of gold, for just in proportion as the duties injure the import trade of India they will injure and divert that export trade on which the demand for India's Council drafts depends. Mr. Barclay Chapman, Financial and Commercial Secretary for the Government of India during the period when Free Trade was achieved for that great dependency, put the matter in a nutshell not long since in our own columns, when he wrote that taxation was no remedy for the real evil, for "the quicksand will swallow all that can be thus achieved and be as hungry as ever."

Reviews.

THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER.

Asiatic Neighbours. By S. S. Thorburn, B.C.S. With two maps. (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons.)

It is a pity that Mr. Thorburn should prejudice his criticism of the relations of England and Russia on the North-West Frontier of India by talking nonsense about matters in England, which are so much more fully within the cognisance and judgment of people at home. Well seasoned as we are with the vagaries of Anglo-Indian opinion, we acknowledge a shock when we chanced upon Mr. Thorburn's contrast of Radical and Conservative policy. "In home politics," says Mr. Thorburn, explaining the "relief to all well-wishers of English rule in India" on the news of the Conservative victory at the polls in 1886, "a Gladstonian Ministry is avowedly the servant of the masses, whereas a Conservative Ministry would lead them." Hence, "in effecting changes, the former acts impulsively, uncertainly, sweepingly; the latter, when strong, with the constructive slowness of evolution observable in the natural world." The difference between them, however, was, "until lately," still more deeply marked in the management of foreign and colonial affairs. "The Gladstonian aims were parochial, the belittlement of England, the contraction of responsibility outside the parish; but the Conservatives were Imperialists, promoters of Great Britain at home and a Greater Britain abroad wherever English is the mother-tongue." Such balderdash as this in the heart of a volume of political criticism, with the name of an experienced Civil Servant on the title page, induces a feeling of hopelessness. One can only presume that Mr. Thorburn repeats the prevailing opinion of his circle without adequate knowledge of the facts, and without any attempt to disengage the true from the false. But, in any case, it is hard upon a reviewer who comes to his book with impartial mind, to be met, on the first chance page, with such a humiliating exhibition of unreasoning prejudice.

Again, Mr. Thorburn compromises his claim to impartial judgment on the matters under discussion by his treatment of "Young India." He enumerates some of the contentions of the Progressive party, including the demand for simultaneous examinations and for the abolition of compensation allowances or their extension to Indians, the protest of an overtaxed nation, and other points. He is then confident enough to express the opinion that "the childish absurdity and inconsequent crudity of most of these aspirations is self-evident." We are not conciliated by his admission that "there is a substratum of sound sense in some of them." The misfortune is that he is wrong, because so grossly prejudiced, in his facts. He sketches a ridiculous caricature, and argues upon it as if it were a faithful photograph. The very backbone of the strength of the Congresswallahs lies in their firm adherence to the ascertainable facts and their cautious self-restraint from anything approaching to extravagance of action. Difference of view we can understand perfectly. But such gross misrepresentation discredits the political historian. Every movement has its weak points, though these do not necessarily constitute sound reasons for contemning the whole as preposterous. We are quite ready to admit that the progress of education in India is dispelling superstitious ideas as to the position of England, unloosing the tongue of sharp criticism, and tending to establish and confirm feelings of native self-reliance and independence. But what else was to be looked for, or to be hoped for? We differ wholly from Mr. Thorburn's notion that the natives are unfitted and unfittable to manage their own affairs to a very large extent, and that they "are happiest under a firm, benevolent, and conservative despotism." Such a position inevitably precludes any possibilities of growth and development. It implies that we shall maintain a glorious empire over some hundreds of millions of serfs or slaves. It abnegates civilisation. It is shockingly unworthy of a nation that rejoices, beyond all things, in the blessings of liberty. Parliament, again, is often admittedly ignorant and selfish in Indian affairs. Recent examples of a painful character may be cited. Very true; but the English nation, if ignorant, is at heart just and sympathetic. The reasonable course, then, would seem to be, not to gird at the English Parliament and people, from whom there is no escape, but to adopt measures to remove their ignorance and to gain free course for the ready stream of their justice and sympathy.

The pivot on which Mr. Thorburn's book turns is the old,—and still burning—question of the North-West Frontier policy. Mr. Thorburn sketches the evolution and effects of Tzardom. He concludes that Russia "is still, through bad government, but a vast inert mass of ignorant humanity, powerful through weight and solidarity alone." She "fights like an ill-trained unwieldly giant, who does not know how to make the most of his strength." Mr. Thorburn enforces this view by recapitulation of the lessons of the Turkish wars of 1853-56 and 1877-78. "When we remember," he even says, "how, only sixteen years ago, the manhood of sixteen million Muhammadans, mostly Asiatics, single-handed waged a successful fight for many months against Russia and her allies, and only succumbed in winter when exhausted from want of food, warm clothing, and munitions of war, English Russophobists, fearful already for the safety of India, ought to be ashamed of their apprehension." This, then, is promising. But when Mr. Thorburn has reviewed the history and geography of the Afghans and the allied tribes, and come to close quarters with the frontier policy, he does not scruple to hold up Mr. Wyllie and "masterly inactivity" to open ridicule page upon page. At the same time he sees clearly enough that Russophobia has been a ghastly source of expenditure from the straitened Indian exchequer. During this century it has, "from first to last, by a series of wasteful missions, alliances, and wars with Persia and Afghanistan, already cost the Indian taxpayers about seventy millions sterling." Mr. Thorburn believes in the principle of "thorough." "To teach a hill tribe a lasting lesson," he asserts, "a lasting loss must be inflicted—a big bag must be made, as in 1891-92 on the Samâna; or a wholesale destruction of valuable property, such as towers, houses, crops, stored grain, must be relentlessly effected. Failing either of those desiderata, a slice of territory should be annexed, or leading men, or a famous family, or section of a clan, blotted out by deportation. *Delenda est Carthago*, the principle followed by Romans and Russians, is the cheapest and least bloody in the end, if the work is to be thorough and enduring." To Mr. Thorburn's mind, therefore, our expeditions between 1888-89 and 1892-93 have been needlessly numerous. Still he seems rather to approve of the more active frontier policy which has been in operation during the past fifteen years or so. For, though it has "conspicuously resulted in a large annual increase of expenditure," still it has brought also "the consequent strengthening of the Trans-Indus military position, and the dawning of a conviction on the minds of the tribesmen generally, and Government beneficiaries in particular, that their interests are identical with those of India." The results do not seem to bear any business-like proportion to the price, and, not a few of us imagine, might have been attained at very much less cost by the employment of very different means.

Mr. Thorburn, however, does not regard with any enthusiasm the enterprise of "taming and mediatising the independent tribes between our actual and our recently defined political frontiers." "Whether the game is worth the candle," he says, "is questionable, as the tribes generally, excepting the sections on the necessary lines of communication, will always be politically *quantités négligeables*" (*sic*); and the work, "if done thoroughly, will prove nearly as difficult and expensive as would be the conquest and retention of Afghanistan itself." For our own part, we are very sure that the work cannot be done thoroughly, perhaps not even on the barbarous principles inculcated by Mr. Thorburn. As to the Russo-Afghan boundary, guaranteed by England, Mr. Thorburn believes that the Trans-Hindu-Kush part of the Amír's kingdom (including Herat, the so-called "Key of India"), roughly amounting to two-fifths of it, is now at the mercy of Russia, being dominated by Russia and inhabited by races alien to the Afghans and more favourable to the rule of the Tzar than to the yoke of the Amír. "Russia is thus already in a position to bring great pressure to bear on India. She can, by occupying Afghan territory just across her own frontier, but 500 inhospitable miles beyond ours, force us, whenever she pleases, to go to war with her, at great initial disadvantage to ourselves. Should we decline the challenge, the alternative of war is that we should 'eat dirt' before all Asia, in which case the invasion of India from Russia's new and advanced frontier would be a possibility." We should certainly stand by our engagements in preference to Mr. Thorburn's foul alternative; and a Russian invasion of India is "a possibility" in any case. Fortunately, however, "it is probable that for many years to come Russia will not attempt to disturb the existing *status quo*, provided that she believes that Great Britain is prepared to fight to preserve it." Russia must be very dense indeed if she does not realize our determination to hold India, as long as we choose, at all hazards. We could wish that Mr. Thorburn had given fuller consideration to the chances of a Russian army in the three Passes with English soldiers massed at the mouths, with plenty of shot and shell and cold steel at hand.

Yet, in spite of large grounds of disagreement, occasional inconsistencies of standpoint, crudeness of tone, and harsh obtrusion of Anglo-Indianism, Mr. Thorburn's book deserves to be read and considered. It is written in a fresh breezy style, and may be taken as substantially representative of the views of a considerable section of Indian officials. On many occasions Mr. Thorburn criticises Indian administration with a free hand. He admits that "Legislative Councils in India are rarely in full sympathy with the people," though "Provincial Legislative Councils do not live in such a remote atmosphere" as the Council of the Governor General. "It may be," he acknowledges, "that neither Local nor Supreme Government realises the extent to which our system is working evil amongst the people." "The natives generally are less content and less trustful of us than they were ten, twenty, or more years ago," and that although "our administration is still in all probability better, purer, and less selfish than that of any other governing power in the world." He desiderates a much simpler system of law and judicial procedure, a more rational control of the money-lender who expropriates the peasant, some check upon the tendency to bureaucracy, and a more prudent and sympathetic government. Prejudiced and wrongheaded as he is, Mr. Thorburn appears to deliver his opinions with independence and honesty, and therefore merits a fair hearing. Besides, his tracing of the course of events during the century down to the present attitude of England and Russia on the North-Western Frontier is a very serviceable piece of historical work, which deserves frank recognition.

BALLADS OF THE MARATHAS.

Ballads of the Marathas. Rendered into English verse from the Marathi originals by HARRY ARBUTHNOT ACWORTH, H M. Indian Civil Service, President Bombay Anthropological Society.

IT is now three years since Mr. Acworth and Mr. Shaligram published a collection of some sixty Marathi ballads rescued from fast-approaching oblivion by great pains and at considerable expense. Of some few of these ballads the present volume is a translation. It is curious that, while the works of other Marathi poets have received permanent record in writing, the historical ballads of the Gondhalis, or wandering bards, have been transmitted by oral tradition from generation to generation. The age of railways is unfavourable to the rise of a Homer that should unite the disconnected rhapsodies into a national epic, and by an anachronism Pisistratus appears in the form of Mr. Acworth, and anticipates the work of Homer—nay, even assumes the *rôle* of a Chapman, and gives us an English version that deserves our gratitude and commands our respect. For the Englishman who can admire bravery in a foe and is content to chant his praises to the tune of "Fuzzy-wuzzy," the fierce race that towards the end of the eighteenth century threatened the infancy of our Indian Empire must have more than ordinary interest, and their ballads, which more fully than any other form of literature breathe the spirit of the race, merit special notice. Under three centuries of Muhammadan sway the national spirit and national literature of the Marathas sank to a low ebb, and the revival of the popularity of the Gondhalis coincides with the re-awakening of national life at the beginning of the seventeenth century, culminating in the restoration of Marathi freedom by Shiwaji about 1650. Thus the ballads which are before us cover a period of more than a century and a half, the most modern theme being the battle of Kirkee in 1816. But there are other and more recent songs among those still sung by the Gondhalis—one even celebrates the praises of a railway locomotive. Surely ballad poetry can no farther go. This is its swan-song, and Mr. Acworth was well-advised in anticipating its early extinction, and in rescuing what he could from impending dissolution.

In the useful and interesting introduction to the book testimony is borne to the poetic susceptibility of the Marathas. "In every town and village of the Deccan and Konkan, especially during the rains, the pious Maratha will be found enjoying with his family and friends the recitation of the Pothi of Shridhur, and enjoying it indeed. Except an occasional gentle laugh, or a sigh, or a tear, not a sound disturbs the rapt silence of the audience, unless when one of those passages of supreme pathos is reached, which affects the whole of the listeners simultaneously with an outburst of emotion which drowns the voice of the reader." From such a people as this one would look for a race of minstrels of exceptional merit. Nor, to judge from the specimens of their work which are here presented, would he look in vain. The chief characteristics of the poems are vivid description combined with forcible simplicity of language. This is as it should be. Rendered into English ballad metre for the most part, they are full of passages that recall the old English ballads, or the stirring lays of Macaulay. The opening of the first translation bears a strong resemblance to the famous first stanzas of Horatius.

> "The huge and rocky castle
>   Which all the whirlwinds sweep;
> Ghosala, and the hamlet
>   By Matunghur that sleep;
> The lovely homes that nestle
>   Above the Konkan green.
> Like the sacred lotus swimming
>   On the water clear and sheen."

Again there is something Homeric about the description of Amba, who, like Pallas Athene, takes an active part in battle on occasion:

> "The haughty summons Amba heard
> And felt with woe her bosom stirr'd.
> Like starven corpse her form she dress'd,
> About was wound a tawny vest,
> The cowries rattled on her breast.
> And thus, the battle to restore
> She called to aid her heavenly lore,
> Flew to the outer gate and bade
> It ope, the stubborn wood obey'd:
> She called the troops outside to aid;
> Thousands at once, with mighty din,
> Shouting their war-cry pour within.

In some of the ballads, too, there is more than a trace of the Homeric fondness for details of bloodshed which we forbear to quote. In fact, to attempt to quote all the good things in the volume would be to run serious risk of infringing the Copyright Act. "The Battle of Kirkee," "The Ballad of Sulochana"—the popularity of which amongst Marath women is strong evidence of their good taste in matters poetic—and finally the "Story of a Sanyasee" would have to be quoted in full. The last shows our Pisistratus performing the functions of rhapsodist, Pisistratus, and Chapman at once. For the Marathi original consists merely of fragments which have had to be collected, arranged, and completed, before the work of translation could begin. Freed therefore to a large extent from the trammels that confine the translator, Mr. Acworth has made excellent use of his freedom, and the result more than confirms the favourable estimate of his muse which a reading of the earlier ballads had suggested. It is impossible for us to say exactly how much is due to the poet, how much to the translator. Even if we assume an inspired original, more than average gifts are required to enable a man to reach in translation the level of the concluding lines of this gem of the collection. It contains some admirable descriptive writing:

> "Now fade the fires of summer, the loaded West winds blow,
> And the cliff's deep bosom gathers the heavy clouds below.
>
> . . . .
>
> From fire-tipped hill to hill-top the lightning leaps and glows,
> The roll of the stamm'ring thunder on its broken footsteps goes."

And so on for some twenty lines. Then comes the vivid presentation of a tortured soul which recalls Rossetti's "A Last Confession" and does not fall short of its power. The conclusion, tragic and effective in its simplicity, is this:

> "For the gods are good. I have suffer'd; I have purchas'd heav'n, and yet
> Let the fires of hell receive me—so I may at least forget."

On the whole, Indian folk-lore is fortunate in counting amongst its students so enthusiastic a collector and so able a translator as the President of the Bombay Anthropological Society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

(*Extracted from the* "REVIEW OF REVIEWS,")
WITH ADDITIONS.

DECEMBER, 1894.

ARENA (Gay and Bird). "The Mystic Brotherhood of India."

GREAT THOUGHTS (28, Hutton Street, Fleet Street). "The Cambridge Mission at Delhi."

HOMILETIC REVIEW (Funk and Wagnall). Ellinwood, F. F., "A Hindu Missionary in America."

INDIAN CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW (78, New Bond Street.) Cust, R. N., "The Civil Disabilities of Christian Converts in India."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). Sorabji, Cornelia, "Indian Women as Wives and Widows." The Marchioness of Dufferin and Ava, "The United Kingdom Branch of the Countess of Dufferin's Fund."

INVESTOR'S REVIEW (29, Paternoster Row). "The Trade of India and the Indian Debt."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

(*Extracted from the* "PUBLISHERS' CIRCULAR.")
WITH ADDITIONS.

DECEMBER, 1894.

TREVOR, COLONEL G. H. ...."Rhymes of Rajputana." (Macmillan).	7s. 6d.
BILLINGTON, MARY FRANCES..............."Woman in India." Illustrated from original photographs. (Chapman and Hall).............	14s. 0d.
YOUNG, LOUIS TARLETON, M.D................"The Carlsbad Treatment for Tropical Ailments, and how to carry it out in India." (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink).................	———
GEORGE, E. MONSON ...."Railways in India." (Effingham Wilson).	———
THE ROYAL INDIAN ENGINEERING COLLEGE CALENDAR FOR 1894-95. (W. H. Allen).	5s. 0d.
CONWAY, WILLIAM MARTIN ...."Climbing and Exploration in the Karakoram-Himalayas." (Fisher Unwin).	15s. 0d.
CHESNEY, GENERAL SIR GEORGE, K.C.B., M.P....... "Indian Polity." A view of the System of Administration in India." (Longmans).....	21s. 0d.
BRADLAUGH BONNER, HYPATIA ...."Charles Bradlaugh." A Record of his Life and Work. 2 vols. (Fisher Unwin).	21s. 0d.

Printed by A. BONNER, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]
[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 2.
(NEW SERIES.)]

FEBRUARY, 1895.

[SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID,
Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus" ..	33
Wanted: A More Excellent Way	38
More "Chips"	40
OUR LONDON LETTER	41
RELIGIOUS RIOTS IN INDIA: Memorial of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha	43
CORRESPONDENCE: Lord Brassey on India	47
"A Protest against Railway Extension in India"	48
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects..	48
THE ADMINISTRATION OF CIVIL AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN INDIA, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A.	49
THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT: ITS SUGGESTED EXTENSION, by F. Pincott	53
THE TENTH CONGRESS: Presidential Address by Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P. ..	57
Summary of Resolutions passed	60
REVIEW: Theosophistry	64

Indiana.

On another page will be found some of the most important passages from the address which Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., delivered at Madras as President of the tenth Congress. Those who professed to doubt Mr. Webb's fitness for this office took a narrow view of political sympathy. "My country," says Mr. Webb, in the words of William Lloyd Garrison, "is the world; my countrymen are all mankind." A member of the Irish Parliamentary Party, Mr. Webb knows what it is to champion the weak against the strong. A member of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, he has been actively engaged in advocating Indian reform in the House of Commons. A Protestant returned by a Roman Catholic constituency he is well fitted to exhort men to tolerate amicably differences of religious opinion. Nobody who reads Mr. Webb's address will deny that it is marked throughout by studious moderation of tone. Critics of the Congress, in India and in London, who evolve their facts from their inner consciousness are apt to paint the policy of the Congress in the hues of earthquake and eclipse. The exposure is severe, but it is an exposure of their own ignorance and prejudice. Mr. Webb paid a warm tribute to the Indian Civil Service. Its members, he says, become sincerely anxious for the welfare of Indians and devoted to what they believe to be India's highest good. The pity of it is that this belief is sometimes disastrously narrow and ill-informed. Too many civilians, with the best intentions in the world, hold aloof from the people and are found wanting in circumstances of difficulty through sheer lack of knowledge. It would be as unfair to judge the Indian Civil Service from its worst as it would be ridiculous to judge it from its best members. The Indian National Congress, at any rate, abstains from personal criticism. It is more concerned with measures than with men, with reform of system and of policy than with attacks upon individuals.

Mr. Webb is a Nationalist member, but he was careful not to load India with the burden of the Irish question. Our Unionist friends sometimes ask whether India's difficulties are not grave enough already without being increased by the animosity of political parties. The theory is excellent, but in practice one usually finds that the advocates of a humane and liberal policy in one latitude are the advocates of a similar policy in other latitudes. The amateur of coercion in Ireland is not usually the most vigorous opponent of repression in India. Yet that is no reason why India, being under the necessity of begging crumbs from Liberals and Conservatives in turn, should go out of her way to make enemies of either. Everybody will agree, nevertheless, that India has a direct interest in the settlement of the Irish question. India wants more attention in the House of Commons and Ireland blocks the way. Meantime, with remarkable self-restraint, India has formulated her programme, and it is being discussed and supported with increasing energy by the educated classes of the Indian community. The cynic may perhaps find material for amusement in the fact that members and organs of the party which, in the United Kingdom, claims a monopoly of education and intelligence habitually sneer at the Indian National Congress on the ground that its supporters are drawn chiefly from the educated class. The Indian National Congress, it seems, would be more acceptable to these critics if its members were not able to spell words of two syllables. The party of all the talents forgets that there is not a solitary reform in the Congress programme which, when it is accomplished, will fail to benefit the dumb masses of the Indian people.

The poverty of India is, of necessity, the chief theme of every competent speaker or writer who attempts to grapple with the Indian problem. It ought not to be necessary to show that a deduction of five per cent. from an income of twenty rupees is heavier than a deduction of 7½ per cent. from an income of £33. Yet official optimists who contrast taxation in India and in the United Kingdom overlook this obvious fact, although it lies at the root of the demand for graduated taxation. India is terribly poor and taxation has admittedly reached the highest possible point, but what Sir Auckland Colvin calls the perilous growth of Indian expenditure continues nevertheless. The first demand of the Congress is for economical administration. The demand for adequate representation of the people in the government of the country is based partly upon the same need, though it aims also at securing more enlightened methods in every department.

Mr. Webb naturally made special reference to the question of Simultaneous Examinations. Until the House of Commons decides that its will shall not be over-ridden by its officials, India must continue to claim this fulfilment of the most solemn pledges. Meantime, those who dislike agitation in India will have to blame the India Office and Anglo-Indian bureaucrats. Englishmen are used to boast of the blessings which their administration of justice has conferred upon India. So long as judicial and executive functions are combined in one and the same official, and so long as scandals like the Balladhun trials remain, the boast will have a hollow ring. In spite of all, Mr. Webb bade his hearers be of good courage. "Within the lifetime of a generation you have obtained what may be regarded as the first instalment of reform in the direction of the expansion and reconstruction of the Legislative Councils, which has cost other countries centuries of toil and effort. You have every reason to be proud of what you have achieved in other directions. You must not be cooled by temporary discouragements, by the unfaithfulness of some, the want of faith of the many. Reform progresses like the steady rise of the tide through many an ebb and flow of the waves."

It is amusing to read the criticisms of Anglo-Indian journals upon the recent Congress. The combination of bad temper and worse English of which they chiefly consist is ridiculous enough. What is still more ridiculous is the completeness with which one hostile journal answers another. The *Pioneer*, for example—that model of decent journalism—sneers at Mr. Webb, writes about "scene-shifters" and "general utility men," and suggests that the Congress is nothing more than a parcel of fools. The *Bombay Gazette*, on the other hand, speaks of "the undoubted acumen of the Congress leaders." The *Pioneer* abuses Mr. Webb, and says that "the leaders of the Congress movement in this country are to be pitied in that they have failed to secure a star company of actors this year." But the *Times of India* roundly declares that

> "more wisdom and good sense can be found in the unpretending address of this shrewd, eloquent, and fair-minded Irishman than in all the preceding Presidential addresses put together."

The *Bombay Gazette* is hardly less laudatory. It says that for "wholesome truth" and "lofty sentiment" Mr. Webb's address "deserves the careful consideration of Congressmen and their supporters both in India and at home." The *Times of India* thinks that Mr. Webb "is able to take large and fair views of the main purpose and characteristics of British rule in this land," while the *Bombay Gazette* "readily agrees" with Mr. Webb's "remarks regarding the injustice of some of the Home Charges," and trusts that "his friendliness to India will in future show itself in the direction of protesting in Parliament against these burdens." Of course it is not all like this. The Anglo-Indian journals with one accord betray painful signs of disappointment and disgust at Mr. Webb's abstinence from the language of abuse. These amiable organs of opinion forget. Mr. Webb is not an Anglo-Indian journalist charged with the duty of setting an example to the vernacular press.

By the death of his Highness the Máháràja of Mysore India suffers a severe loss. Under his just and enlightened rule Mysore has become a model state, and he and his Prime Minister, Sir K. Sheshadri Iyer, K.C.S.I., "attempted" as Sir William Hunter has said "the solution of political problems at which we still look askance in British India." In the opinion of the *Bombay Gazette*—and it is the opinion of all competent observers—the Máhárája attained an administrative success not surpassed in any part of India, British or feudatory.

> "In all the ordinary duties of an Indian Government—in the administration of justice, in the collection and expenditure of the revenue, in the protection afforded to life and property, in public instruction, in sanitation, in public works—it is admitted that the Government of the Máhárája Chamarajendra Wadier compares not unfavourably with that of the provinces under direct British rule. In some highly important respects—in the development of communications, in female education, in precautions against famine, in the encouragement of mining and other industries, and in the fostering of habits of local self-government among the people—it is held by many (and apparently with some reason) that the State of Mysore is ahead of most of the rest of India."

Coming from the scource it does, this eulogy is worthy of remark although it understates the case. Our columns have from time to time borne testimony to the excellence of administrative methods in Mysore, and especially to the success of its great representative assembly. Nothing could be more calamitous than any attempt to interfere with this conspicuous example of wise native rule. A notification has been issued which sanctions the succession of the late Máháraja's eldest son and approves the administration of the State, temporarily, by the Dewan. This is as it should be. The notification adds that "the Dewan will ask for and follow the advice of the Resident on all matters of importance." The newly appointed Resident is Mr. Lee Warner. The responsibilities of his position should cause him to walk circumspectly, knowing as he does that his actions in other capacities have not always given universal satisfaction. The Dewan will also consult the wishes of her Highness the Máhárani, with whom all India sympathises in her bereavement.

How comes it that, in spite of a general complaint as to "hard times," there is an undeniable increase of luxury in England? What with agricultural depression and bad trade, how does it happen that there is nevertheless "no decrease in the income-tax returns which measure the joint well-being of the well-to-do classes?" Mr. Grant Allen put these interesting questions in an article which appeared in the *Westminster Gazette* and on January 22nd, in a letter printed in the same journal, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., offered an answer. In April, 1893, Sir W. Harcourt described the continual growth of the yield of the income-tax as "simply marvellous" and as "one of the most remarkable features of our finance." The Chancellor of the Exchequer said:

> "In 1886, that is at the commencement of the last Parliament, the income tax yielded £1,980,000 to the penny. In 1893, which has just concluded, it yielded £2,261,000 to the penny. . . . . Schedule D, which is equally remarkable—it is the profits of trades, companies, and so forth, yielded in 1886—£958,000 to the penny; and in 1893, in spite of the ruin which is said to have attended all trades and to have destroyed all profits, it is £1,268,000 to the penny, the highest it has ever reached."

What is the explanation? The explanation lies, Mr. Naoroji says, in what Lord Salisbury has called the "bleeding" of British India. British India is "bled" every year by all kinds of British interests to the estimated amount of twenty millions, while the real amount is probably much higher. As Mr. Naoroji writes:

> "The Chancellor of the Exchequer puts the income tax in 1886 as £1,980,000 to the penny, in 1893 £2,261,000 to the penny, giving an increase of £281,000 in seven years, making an average of £40,000 increase every year. Taking the 'bleeding' of British India to be only £20,000,000 a year, this amount increases the income tax here every year £83,000 to the penny. It is this £83,000 (and probably much more) which makes up first for the 'depression,' and leaves the further yearly balance of the 'marvellous' increase of £40,000."

That is the explanation. "It is this torrent of wealth, drained from British India and flowing into this country from the wretchedness and 'extreme poverty' of Indian *British* subjects (not the subjects of the Native States), that rejoices the heart of the Chancellor of the Exchequer of this country, depresses to despair the heart year after year of the Finance Minister of British India, and starves millions and sweeps off millions from the loss and want of means to resist famine."

These facts suggest a further question which Mr. Naoroji states as follows:—

> "Here are two countries (the United Kingdom and British India) administered for more than a century by administrators drawn from the same class of the British people (only the official in British India being far more highly paid and praised), with this strange result. The people of the United Kingdom were able to pay in 1893 for income-tax £2,261,000 to the penny—or for a population of 38,000,000 14¼d. per head: while the people of British India could pay only about Rsx 300,000 to the penny, or for a population of 221,000,000 less than even a farthing (about eight decimals of a farthing), taking exchange at 1s. 3d. per rupee. Or putting it in another way, the people of British India, under the present evil system of administration, can hardly pay per head the seventy-second part of what the people of the United Kingdom are able to pay per head, and this with an exemption of only Rs. 500, or at 1s. 3d., of £31 in place of the exemption of £150 in this country."

It is manifest at once that the system to which this condition of affairs is due is not good for India. But is it good for the United Kingdom? Let Mr. John Bright answer. Speaking in the House of Commons, nearly forty years ago, Mr. Bright said:—"You may govern India if you like for the good of England, but the good of England must come through the channel of the good of India. There are but two modes of gaining anything by our connection with India. The one is by plundering the people of India, and the other by trading with them. I prefer to do it by trading with them. But in order that England may become rich by trading with India, India itself must become rich." Mr. Naoroji's conclusion is irresistible:—

> "What a pity and how sad it is that, while the British Indian authorities—by adopting the second 'mode,' on the basis of justice and righteousness, and of treating the Indians as British subjects instead of British helots—can secure for the British people many times more benefits than they get at present, and can place the British connection on the solid foundation of loyalty and satisfaction—they prefer to ruin British India and mar the prospects of British rule!"

Whatever else may be said of the imposition of the import duty upon cotton goods it has, at any rate, made India unusually prominent in the speeches of English politicians and the columns of English newspapers. If any considerable part of the discussion upon Indian finance which the subject has excited could have been diverted from the symptoms to the cause of embarrassment, much good would undoubtedly have ensued. As it is, discussion has turned upon the symptoms, and, even so, has been both superficial and selfish. We examine on another page the leading contentions which have been put forward in regard to the import and the excise duties. The frankly selfish opinion was stated at a meeting of cotton employers and operatives held at Manchester on January 8th. The meeting demanded the abolition of the import duty on cottons, or, failing that, the imposition of a general excise on all cotton yarns manufactured in India. This demand has only two disadvantages, but they are serious ones. In the first place, it assumes that India is to be "run" in the interests of Lancashire. In the second place, if it were a reasonable demand on the part of cotton manufacturers it would be reasonable also on the part of manufacturers of any other articles upon which import duty is imposed. In other words, the real assumption of the Manchester meeting was that India might legitimately be forced into insolvency in the supposed interests of British commerce. Mr. Fowler refused to admit this assumption, and Lancashire—or a small portion of it—was dissatisfied in consequence. It is to the credit of the Conservative press that, for the most part, it refrained from making use of the opportunities which this dissatisfaction offered of attack upon the Government.

Unfortunately Mr. A. J. Balfour, M.P., took a less creditable course. In a speech delivered to his constituents at Manchester on January 17th he was content to play the part—unusual for him—of Mr. Facingbothways. He repudiated the idea that India was to be governed for the pecuniary benefit of Lancashire. But he was highly indignant at the erection of "fiscal barriers" and at the theory—which he alone has discovered—"that the English manufacturer should be dumb under every circumstance." He admitted that no British industry ought to be "more near to our hearts than the financial solvency of the Indian Empire." But he was disposed to think that "the English Government have assented to a scheme of taxation in India which does amount, in substance and in truth, to a protective prohibition against Lancashire goods." Can we wonder that, in view of these adroitly balanced propositions, even that loyal Tory organ, the *St. James's Gazette* was compelled to say: "it looks as if our leader were still sitting on the fence"?

In contrast with Mr. Balfour's temporising timidity we may well place the frank and outspoken language which Mr. Asquith used at Hull on January 22nd. The Home Secretary said, and the *Times* accidentally omitted the passage from its report:

> "For my part when questions of this kind come to be considered, I repudiate with all the strength and energy of conviction of which I am capable, the notion that they ought to be determined in the slightest degree by electoral considerations in this country, by the desire to secure or to retain the vote of this interest or this district or of that. I say that what we have to regard are the interests of the Indian people, and if in those interests fiscal measures, even though they be injurious to British trade, require to be adopted, both policy and honour demand from us that we should make the sacrifice."

That is as it should be. But if the Government has really acted upon this equitable theory it is hard to understand its insistence upon a countervailing excise duty in the case of cotton goods. If the excise duty were justifiable, as it is not, in the case of cotton goods it would be equally justifiable, as the Bombay Millowners' Association contends, in the case of woollens, silks and mixed goods. The truth is, of course, that Mr. Fowler has tried to please both India and Lancashire and has offended both. The *Daily News* opines that "the Indian National Congress made a grave mistake when it took up this hollow grievance, which does not affect the Indian consumer at all, and has simply been got up by millowners desirous of being exempted from competition." But the grievance is not hollow. The differential treatment which has been ordered in the case of cotton goods is not compatible with Mr. Asquith's doctrine that "what we have to regard are the interests of the Indian people."

The pity of it is that Lancashire is wasting her energies in resisting the import duties instead of resisting the extravagant policy which has rendered the import duties necessary. Mr. Javerilal U. Yajnik hit the nail on the head in his Presidential Address at the Seventh Provincial Conference:

> "The people of India did not and do not desire the re-imposition of cotton duties or any import duties at all if the condition of Indian finance can dispense with it. And if the powerful influence of Manchester could be brought to bear upon the reduction of the overgrown military and civil expenditure, so as to dispense with the necessity ef extra taxation, we have no particular wish to see them levied again."

Mr. Balfour, in the speech to which I have referred accepted the theory of Sir James Westland that the

Indian deficit is due "to exchange only, and to nothing but exchange." Mr. Balfour forgets that the Bombay Presidency Association and the British Committee of the Indian National Congress have disproved this theory and have shown, with the concurrence of experts like Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir D. Barbour, that the deficit is due to policy, and especially to the increase in military expenditure.

"I do not believe," says Mr. Balfour, "that any solution is possible other than the currency solution," in other words, bimetallism. If Mr. Balfour were right the position of India would indeed be hopeless. "We do not," writes the *Times*, "share his sanguine belief, nor are we prepared to admit that even if bimetallism had been put into operation twenty years ago, when he arrived at his present convictions, all financial difficulty would have been averted." All that Mr. Balfour said—and he said a great deal—as to the disadvantages which are imposed upon the Lancashire cotton industry by the policy of the Government of India is only so much reason why Lancashire members should insist upon a policy of economy in India. Immediately at the opening of the new Session an opportunity will arise when Mr. Fowler moves for the appointment of his Select Committee upon Indian Expenditure. In Mr. Asquith's opinion, "it is very difficult to reduce expenditure" in India. But has any honest and persistent effort been made to reduce it?

A Bombay correspondent sends me a copy of the following trenchant leaflet which has been printed and circulated under the title: "Does Lord Harris Deserve a Permanent Memorial?"

YES.	NO.
ACCORDING TO HIS FRIENDS AND ADMIRERS.	ACCORDING TO NATIVE PUBLIC OPINION.
1. Because he is a jolly good fellow and a keen cricketer to boot.	1. Because there is not a single public act of importance which could be fairly associated with his name or which could be reasonably pointed out as having materially promoted the permanent interests of the people of this Presidency.
2. Because he is kindness itself, and smothers those who have the "privilege" to come into contact with him with an abundance of rosewater and kisses which is simply charming.	2. Because his Government is singularly unfortunate in tact, sound judgment, and strict impartiality which should characterise any administration desirous of achieving success and inspiring popular confidence and respect.
3. Because he possesses those eminent qualifications of "straightforwardness" and "manly intercourse" which contribute so much towards eliciting popular esteem and regard.	3. Because he systematically ignores public opinion and more or less rules on the opinion of a bureaucracy well known for its prejudice, passion, and unsympathetic attitude towards all legitimate native wishes and aspirations.
4. Because in the conduct of the administration it is his policy never to regard public opinion, which he considers chaotic and ill-natured, if not ill-informed, but courageously acts on the opinion of his "responsible" advisers, who, being "experts," exactly know what is or what is not best for the welfare of the people.	4. Because he neither cares to understand the true bearings of native grievances nor makes a serious attempt to render justice where justice is due. Moreover, where European interests collide with those of natives his Government gives the go-by to the latter.
5. Because he insists on a party press as the only effectual means of learning the truth on public affairs, and acting with "the strictest justice and impartiality."	5. Because in the matter of the riots he has displayed a temper and a judgment which were not only uncalled for but utterly unworthy of one in his exalted and responsible position.
6. Because he is a staunch advocate of physical education among all classes of the native community, and has won golden opinions for his personal encouragement in the matter on the cricket fields of Bombay and Poona.	6. Because his ill-concealed bias against and unfounded attack on one of the great communities of the Presidency has been provocative of great indignation and sullen discontent.
7. Because take him for all in all, he is a good governor, albeit of mediocre talent.	7. Because he is everything which a Governor should not be, and has alienated the sympathies of the native community as a whole.

The Second Annual Report of the Kala Bhavan (Temple of Art), Baroda (Bombay: Printed at the Education Society's Press), serves to remind one that education in India has made rapid strides during recent years. The foundation of colleges, the formation of good schools, and the encouragement given to all classes of parents to attend to the education of their children have been followed by a notable advance. It is not by any means to the British Administration alone that this advance is due. It is due also to the enlightened action of the rulers of many Native States, who have given money and have themselves taken a strong personal interest in educational work. The kind of education which it was perhaps most urgently necessary to introduce was technical and scientific. Classical education may or may not be thought indispensable, but it is imperative that modern science should be taught in India. The need of it was strongly urged by the Government of India in 1888 in its Resolution on State-aided education. The Resolution observed, and observed rightly, that a population which was rapidly outgrowing the means of support under existing methods of agriculture ought to be made acquainted with the best scientific methods of developing the resources and improving the manufactures of the country.

The Kala Bhavan of Baroda is an institution that closely resembles an English technical school. It owed its creation to the public-spirited and munificent Gaekwar of Baroda, and it is not the least of the many benefits which he has conferred upon his

State. The Report gives the curriculum of the school together with the report of the Principal, Mr. T. K. Gajjar, B.Sc., M.A., and the reports of visitors who have examined the school, including Mr. D. E. Wacha, Dr. Deshmukh, and Professor Middleton. The report shows clearly, among many things that are good, that the school is suffering from two great disadvantages—the attempt to deal with too many subjects, and the want of adequate laboratory accommodation and apparatus. Probably the two defects are in some measure connected with each other. Subjects such as the classical languages, logic and history might perhaps be omitted from the syllabus of such an institution. Practical chemistry, including bleaching and dyeing, and practical physics can never be thoroughly taught while good and well-fitted laboratories are wanting. In such a case, of course, it is far easier to point out the defect than to provide for its removal.

From another, and perhaps more formidable, disadvantage India as a whole suffers in matters of education and especially scientific education. Text-books even in Europe are far from perfect. In India, in the native languages, they rarely exist. It appears from the report which is before me that steps are being taken to secure the production or translation of books in Gujarati. It is possible that such a step, however commendable it may seem at first sight, may have undesirable results. There is some confusion in the terminology of English scientific books —confusion that is perhaps unavoidable in view of the processes of evolution through which the terms have passed and are passing. There must undoubtedly be great difficulty in finding expressions for ideas so alien to the languages of India, and there is a danger that the attempt may result either in the introduction of an undigested mass of foreign words, or in a want of perspicuity in the terminology employed. Many English scientific terms retain a fringe of implication which is prejudicial to their value and certainly makes them difficult to render accurately. In some of the sciences, at least, it might be better for terms to filter through courses of lectures, which should replace text-books, before they settle finally into print.

There is another branch of the Kala Bhavan, which, in these days of trained teachers, calls for special notice—the School of Pedagogy. Of this department Mr. Gajjar speaks highly. It appears to be efficiently managed and to enjoy fair popularity in comparison with the other sections. To quote again from the Resolution of the Government of India: "at the present time, when there is reason to insist on the maintenance of a stricter system of discipline than has been in force in most Indian schools of recent years, it is more than ever necessary that the men entrusted with the education of the youth of the country should be of unquestionable character, trained to habits of teaching, and capable of maintaining by their personal influence and other means a high standard of discipline and morality in the schools over which they preside." The importance of training teachers so as to fit them to cope with the great difficulties which a young educational system has to encounter cannot be exaggerated. Teachers in Indian schools are one of the greatest factors in the introduction of Western civilisation into the country. Through their hands an ever-increasing proportion of the population passes, and they have opportunities of exercising influence such as no agency can possess which comes into operation in later life. Teachers in India not only supply the colleges with students, but the country with men. Mr. Gajjar's success appears to have been great, and we believe that it is increasing and will increase.

FIDUS.

WANTED: A MORE EXCELLENT WAY.

IT is not without reason that the Association of Bombay Cotton Millowners describes the countervailing excise duty upon Indian cotton goods and yarns as "an impolitic and retrograde step, politically and "economically, unjust in conception and incidence, "and impracticable financially as a source of revenue." The Government of India has been compelled, solely for purposes of revenue, to impose a duty of 5 per cent. on cotton goods imported into India. The Government of India ought to have taken this step at the time when it imposed a similar duty on all other imports, but it is easy to understand, although it is humiliating to admit, that the Imperial Government feared to offend the people of Lancashire. Circumstances having proved too strong for this indefensible opposition, the "obnoxious impost," as the *Manchester Guardian* calls it, has been levied, and with it a countervailing excise duty which Mr. Fowler apparently believes to be equitable or expedient. Nobody will dispute the academic proposition that a customs duty may tend to protect the industries of a country engaged in manufacturing the article upon which the duty is imposed. India spins and weaves cotton, and a 5 per cent. import duty upon cotton goods, so far as it goes, has a tendency to give to the Indian spinner or weaver an advantage over his competitors in Lancashire or elsewhere. But, on the other hand, everybody knows that the cotton which is manufactured in India is of coarse quality, and, thanks to the advantages which the cotton manufacturer in India naturally has over his rivals in Europe, he has been able to wrest from the European manufacturer the market for very coarse goods. That is a fact which Indian manufacturers and Lancashire manufacturers alike admit. There are certain classes of goods which, although at one time they were made in Lancashire, and exported to

India, are no longer exported because Lancashire cannot make them and sell them at a profit in competition with Indian manufacturers. Indian manufacturers, on the other hand, are not able to compete to any considerable extent with Lancashire manufacturers in respect of the finer kinds of cotton goods. Here Lancashire enjoys an undisputed advantage, for although some few manufacturers in India have endeavoured to compete with them their success hitherto has not been great. Yet the Secretary of State apparently believes that, in order to be quite fair to Lancashire, he must compel the Government of India to impose an excise duty upon goods which can be said to compete with Lancashire. The Imperial Government, which is British, says in effect: "We shall not make any distinction between "British subjects in England and British subjects in "India. If we tax the one we shall tax the other "also when they compete with one another." The proposition looks fair enough, and it sounds well enough, but it is a pious opinion, a counsel of perfection, which is so far removed from actual facts as to have produced an effect totally different from what Mr. Fowler anticipated. He has fallen between two stools. While there is an outcry in India against the excise duty, there is an outcry in Lancashire against the customs duty. The Government has offended both parties and pleased neither. That is usually what happens when an attempt is made to please everybody, or, in the blunt vocabulary of the politician, "to hold the dish level."

Our objection to the excise duty is that it is vexatious—that it interferes with the conduct of an important industry in India without yielding to the Government any revenue worthy of the name. The Finance Minister admitted as much when he introduced the Bill. Sir James Westland said that the Government of India would not have proposed an excise duty, had it not been so instructed by the Secretary of State. He added that the whole revenue from the excise duty would amount to only a few thousands of pounds. On the other hand, in order to collect this revenue, however small it may be, a staff of officials must be appointed. Either the tax will not be collected at all, or there must be a body of excise officers such as supervise distilling and brewing in England. Now a body of excise officers free to enter a factory at any hour, to intrude into every department, to examine everything that is being done, and to put questions to every person in authority, is a nuisance which should not, without good cause and for an adequate end, be imposed upon manufacturers. If the excise duty were expected to yield a large revenue the case would be different. The Government of India has sown the wind of extravagance, and is reaping the whirlwind of insolvency. It is sadly in want of money, and if it could raise money by means of an excise duty it would have an excuse. But to impose an excise duty which is harassing and annoying to manufacturers, which hampers the methods of manufacture, which will be costly and difficult to collect, and which can bring in no revenue worth naming is a folly that no Government can be excused for committing. To impose such a duty—so useless and so vexatious—simply in order to silence the clamour of an interested body of competitors, is one of those blunders which are worse than crimes. Of course the good people of Lancashire are not in the least degree satisfied. At a meeting of cotton-masters, operatives, and others interested in the trade, held in Manchester on January 8th, resolutions were carried in which it was clearly stated that in the opinion of those who were present the excise duty could not "effectively remove the protective incidence" of the customs duty. Members of Parliament representing Lancashire constituencies were called upon to do their utmost to secure the repeal of the import duty, and they were requested to bring the whole subject to the notice of Parliament without delay. We shall rejoice if the opposition of Lancashire has the effect of proving to the Government that the excise duty is a mistake, and ought not to be continued. India is suffering severely through the accumulated blunders of her Government, and it is essential that every growth of industry should be encouraged. Yet the Government is adding to its other mistakes by actually creating a purposeless nuisance which must disturb an important and growing industry. The Manchester meeting had the assurance to say that the imposition of the import duty on cotton goods was reactionary and unjust. The duty amounts to 5 per cent.—one shilling in the £. A similar duty is imposed upon everything that is imported into India, even upon silver. Not a voice was raised in Lancashire when a 5 per cent. duty was imposed upon other imports. It is only when goods manufactured in Lancashire are taxed by a Finance Minister at his wits' end for revenue that the good people of Lancashire discover the injustice of import duties. Condemnation of this kind imposes upon nobody. It is self-interested, and it is groundless. A Government must pay its way. So long as it has debts it must provide somehow the means of paying them, and in the last resort the Government of India has fallen back upon import duties. That the Government of India has blundered grievously in the past, that its currency policy is a grave mistake, that it has spent and is spending, especially in the civil and the military departments, much more money than it ought to spend or needs to spend, we have never ceased to urge, and we should welcome the assistance of Lancashire if it would join us in advocating rigid economy. But it is not to the purpose at this time of day to tell us that import duties are reactionary.

It is reasonable to ask those who were present at the Manchester meeting what course they would recommend the Government of India to take if it is not to impose customs duties. None of the speakers was able to suggest any practicable alterative. Now, when a body of men professing to represent a great English county and a great English industry condemn the Government of India for raising money in a certain way in order to defray expenditure, the least they can do is to indicate some more excellent way in which the money can be obtained. But no such suggestion was forthcoming. The only alternative to which reference was made was that the United Kingdom should grant a subsidy to India. For our part we are strongly of the opinion that the British taxpayer should pay the cost of the many and expensive operations which are undertaken and the systems which are maintained in India, not for the benefit of the Indian public but in the supposed interests of imperial policy. But this equitable plan is not what is meant by the advocates of subsidy. The representatives of the cotton lords of Lancashire strongly object to contributing one single penny out of their own pockets to relieve the difficulties of India, but they modestly ask that the whole of the United Kingdom should be taxed in order that they may be exempt. Every poor sempstress who drinks a cup of tea must contribute something, but capitalists in Lancashire must not be touched. This is the sort of spirit with which we are asked to sympathise. We do not wonder that the suggestion was withdrawn. Needless to say, the duty on cotton goods imported into India is not paid by the manufacturers nor by the operatives of Lancashire. It is paid by the consumer in India. The only way in which a customs duty could effect Lancashire would be by lowering the demand in India for Lancashire goods. It is possible, of course, that a five per cent. duty may lower the demand to some small extent, but it is not probable. At any rate, those who pay the duty are those who consume the goods, and they cannot escape payment. The question comes to this:—Assuming that the Government of India must meet its liabilities everybody perceives that certain monies have to be raised somehow. Nobody has suggested an easier way. Nobody has suggested any practicable alternative. The Government of India believes that it can raise the money by means of import duties and it has imposed import duties. In these circumstances we do not think that the rather selfish and short-sighted opposition of Lancashire will have much influence with the public. What Lancashire ought to do is, as we contend elsewhere, to insist (generally) upon economical administration in India and (immediately) to strengthen the hands of the Indian Parliamentary Committee in its endeavours to make the most of the Select Committee on Indian Expenditure for which Mr. Fowler has undertaken to move at the opening of the new session of Parliament.

MORE "CHIPS."[1]

SUBSTANTIALLY the Essays in Biography which form the second volume of the new edition of Professor Max Müller's "Chips from a German Workshop" are just a reprint of the "Biographical Essays" which the author published some ten years ago. Those of the Professor's friends who asked him "Who was Rámmohun Roy, or Keshub Chunder Sen? "Who was Colebrooke, or Julius Mohl? What are "they to us? What lesson can we learn from their "lives?"—such friends, and a good many others who would not so nakedly parade their ignorance, ought to be very grateful for the resuscitation of this commemorative volume. Certainly there is no one that is interested in the modern problems of Indian life, literature, and religion, who will not be glad to learn that the old essays have now obtained a new lease of life. For our own part, we should not willingly lose even a single one of the smallest memorial notices which Professor Max Müller has here reprinted. For, as he says, everyone of them "is devoted to a friend whose name well deserves to "be remembered in the midst of the hurry and "forgetfulness of our busy life"— remembered for adding, or attempting to add, a stone or two to the cairn of knowledge, or for endeavouring to exemplify worthily the noble conduct of life.

The largest space is devoted to the revival of religious ideals and practice associated with the names of Rájah Rámmohun Roy, Keshub Chunder Sen, and Protap Chunder Mozumdar. The sketch of the career of Rámmohun Roy takes the form of an address delivered by Professor Max Müller at the Bristol Museum on the fiftieth anniversary of the Rájah's death, September 27th, 1883. It is strongly sympathetic in tone, and marked by striking illustrations from those studies in language and religion which the Professor has made peculiarly his province of learning. To himself it must have been specially gratifying, although perhaps somewhat paradoxical to his auditors, to declare that "turn it as you like, "you cannot escape from the conclusion that Rám-"mohun Roy, however strange his language may "have sounded to his friends at Bristol, was not a "mere stranger when he arrived in Europe, but was "returning, in reality, to his own intellectual kith "and kin." In like manner, Professor Max Müller traces the religious connection between this Arya of the South-Eastern branch of the Aryan race and the Englishman of the time, speaking of the epoch "when the fathers of the Aryan race, that noble "race to which we ourselves belong, which has "since been divided into Greeks and Romans, Celts "and Slaves on one side, and Indians and Persians "on the other, invoked with the same names the "gods of the sky, and the air, and the earth, the "gods whose real presence was felt in the thunder "and the storm and the rain, whose abode was "looked for in the clouds or on the inaccessible "crests of the mountains—but chiefly the God, who "was seen and yet not seen in the sun, who was "revealed every morning in the brightness of the "dawn, and who himself revealed, far away in the "golden East, that infinite Beyond for which human "language has no name, human thought no form, "but which the eye of faith perceives, and after "fashioning it into endless ideal shapes, and en-"dowing it with all that is most beautiful in poetry, "most choice in art, most sublime in philosophy, "calls—God." Having thus established the historical antecedents and character of the visit of "the "first Bráhman who ever crossed the sea," Professor Max Müller states the facts of his life and the growth of his religious ideas. "What Rámmohun Roy "wanted for India was a Christianity purified of all "mere miracles, and relieved of all theological rust "and dust, whether it dated from the first council "or from the last. That Christianity he was willing "to preach, but no other, and in preaching that "Christianity he might still, he thought, remain a "Bráhman, and a follower of the religion of the "Veda." He did not oppose Bráhmanism, but only the perversion of it, endeavouring to show that the idolatry of the Bráhmans was contrary to ancient principles and practice. Professor Max Müller relates the trials he underwent in the promotion of his views, and gives the main points in the history of the Bráhma-Samáj (or society of the believers in Bráhman, the Supreme Spirit) during the life of Rámmohun Roy. "I am quite aware," says the Professor, "that the movement which "he initiated, and which was carried on by "Keshub Chunder Sen and Protap Chunder "Mozumbar, is languishing at present, but it "possesses the vitality of truth, and if there "is ever to be an honest reform of the national "religion of India, and a real approach to Chris-"tianity, it can only be on the lines laid down by "these now half-forgotten reformers."

---

[1] "*Chips from a German Workshop.*" By F. Max Müller. New Edition. Vol. II: Biographical Essays. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co).

Professor Max Müller continues the history of the Bráhma-Samáj in a sketch of Keshub Chunder Sen. The important part played by Debendranáth Tagore is divided between the two biographies of Rámmohun Roy and Keshub Chunder Sen. The principles declared by Keshub at the opening of his own church on August 22, 1869, after separation from Debendranáth and the formation of the "Bráhma-"Samáj of India," differ but slightly from the authoritative summary of the doctrines of the old Bráhma-Samáj as accepted by Debendranáth; but, in the practical carrying out of their doctrines, the roads of the two teachers were diverging more and more. Professor Max Müller finds it difficult to lay his finger on the exact causes of the breach. They were hardly doctrinal; they were not personal.

> "They were, so far as we can judge, such as arise when practical measures have to be discussed and decisions have to be taken. Then interests seem to clash, misunderstandings become inevitable, misrepresentations are resorted to, and newspaper gossip makes retreat from untenable positions very difficult. So far as I can judge, Debendranáth and his friends were averse to unnecessary innovations, and afraid of anything likely to wound the national feelings of the great mass of the people. They wanted above all to retain the national character of their religion. . . . . They pleaded for toleration for Hindu usages and customs which appeared to them innocent. . . . . It may be that Keshub Chunder Sen's devotion to Christ also, which became more and more pronounced from year to year, disquieted the minds of the Bráhmas. . . . . Keshub Chunder Sen, however, was at that time absorbed far less in doctrinal questions than in practical measures of reform.

The Professor deals with the charges against Keshub "which envy and ignorance engendered in the hearts "of his countrymen." He speaks of Keshub's visit to England, where the reformer "saw the most dis-"tinguished statesmen, scholars, and divines, and "made a real study of all the institutions intended "for the improvements of the young, the succour of "the sick, and the punishment of criminals." "I "have come to England," Keshub said, "to study "the spirit of Christian philanthropy, of Christian "charity, and honourable Christian self-denial." The practical results of the visit soon began to appear in the activities of the reformer and his followers on his return to India. As the Bráhma-Samáj of India grew stronger, however, so also did the spirit of opposition among his followers. The crisis was precipitated by the sudden announcement of the betrothal of Keshub's daughter to the Rájah of Cutch Behar. Professor Max Müller appends to his biography of Keshub some most interesting correspondence that passed between them, in which are set out the views of both on the most important points at issue. A new Samáj, called the Sádháran Bráhma-Samáj, or the Catholic Samáj, was founded by a large number of Keshub's old adherents. Keshub, says Professor Max Müller, "seems to me "never to have recovered from this blow." It was in beautiful dramatic propriety that Debendranáth Tagore should have been in communion with him when he died. He had filled his hands too full. "What he aspired to was not only the religious "regeneration of India, but the religious regenera-"tion of the whole world." In the correspondence before mentioned there are also some interesting letters from Protap Chunder Mozumdar. "Keshub "Chunder Sen's genius," says Protap, "is too "Western for his own countrymen, and too Eastern "for yours."

Very interesting also is Professor Max Müller's sketch of Dayánanda Sarasvatí, the founder and leader of the Árya-Samáj, who took his stand on the Vedas, which he looked upon as divine revelation. "To him not only was everything contained in the "Vedas perfect truth, but he went a step further, "and by the most incredible interpretations suc-"ceeded in persuading himself and others that "everything worth knowing, even the most recent "inventions of modern science, were alluded to in "Vedas. Steam-engines, railways, and steam-boats, "all were shown to have been known, at least in "their germs, to the poets of the Vedas, for Veda, "he argued, means divine knowledge, and how "could anything have been hid from that?" There is intense interest and a deep pathos in the kindly memorials of Bunyiu Nanjio and Kenjiu Kasawara, two young Buddhist priests from Japan, who came to Oxford to study in 1879. There needs no remark now on the biographies of the great scholars—Colebrooke, Julius Mohl, Bunsen—Charles Kingsley, and Wilhelm Müller (the Professor's gifted and distinguished father). And it is sufficient to repeat our cordial appreciation of the dozen of short notices concluding the volume.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Mr. H. H. Asquith, M.P., stated clearly at Hull on January 22nd, the principle which ought to control the administration of India: "The Indian Government, for the purpose of making the expenditure and the revenue balance one another, resolved to impose an import duty on all foreign goods brought into the country. I should like to know on what principle we can justify, we who are responsible for the Government of India, an exception from that tariff of a particular class of goods which happen to be manufactured in a particular county here in England. (Hear, hear.) Gentlemen, we hold India in trust for the people of India. (Cheers.) Our rule rests, it is true, ultimately on *force*, but it is a rule which is safeguarded, and which is dignified by the confident belief of the people that the power which we have obtained by *force* we shall use in their interest, and not in our own. (Cheers.)"

The following passage from a speech delivered by Mr. A. J. Balfour, M.P., to his constituents at Manchester on January 17th, is worth placing on record: "I repudiate, on behalf of myself, and I repudiate on behalf of every Lancashire man for whom I have the right to speak, the idea that we regard India as nothing else than a source of wealth to us, as a community which we can control for our own pecuniary benefit, and from which it is not only in our power but in our right to wring, so to speak, the last grain of profit that our superior powers render it possible for us to extract from her. That would be, indeed, a mean and an ungenerous policy—indeed, would be utterly unworthy of England and of Lancashire. (Hear, hear.) For my own part, neither now nor at any time will I make myself the spokesman of a policy or party—if party there be, and I do not believe there is, or will be, such a party—which takes so degraded a view of the relations which subsist between us and our great dependency."

Mr. Balfour's testimony as to the poverty of the mass of the Indian community is also worth preserving: "There is no British industry which ought to be more near to our hearts than the financial solvency of the Indian Empire. India is not the only dependency of whom we are proud, and of whom we have a right to be proud. It is a country in which we have taken a great responsibily on ourselves, which responsibility cannot by any possibility be fulfilled if the financial position of India is insecure; and recollect the taxation in every country is a difficult matter, but it is a doubly, a trebly, difficult matter in India. It is not enough to say that India is rich, as, indeed, I think in one sense of the word she is rich. The mass of her population, take them unit for unit, are very poor. The sources of revenue open to any government are extremely limited, and even if there be wealth available for the purposes of taxation which, if it could be got at, would not either destroy the springs of industry or inflict any great hardship upon the general population of the country, that wealth cannot by any machinery at our disposal really be got at; and the sources of revenue, therefore, open to the Indian Government, on which alone the Indian Government can rely in order to meet its financial obligations, are necessarily few, and very nearly exhausted."

Mr. Balfour accepted the official theory that the Indian deficit is due to loss by exchange. He said:—"The difficulties between England and India are exchange difficulties, and exchange difficulties only, and if India at this moment is to make up a deficit she has to make it up simply and solely because she has to make payments in gold in England and has only depreciated silver wherewith to make them. If there were a par of exchange between gold and silver there not only would be no deficit in India at this moment, but there never would have been a deficit in all these years, and the surplus in the hands of the Indian Minister of Finance would have been sufficient, and more than sufficient, for all the requirements—(A voice: 'I question')—more than sufficient for all the requirements of the country. I understand some gentleman queries that. My authority is the Indian Finance Minister. (Cheers.) If my friend will look at the Blue Book recently published by the Government he will see that the Indian Finance Minister distinctly states, in so many words and with the utmost explicitness of expression, that the deficits are due to exchange only, and to nothing but exchange." Mr. Balfour omitted to add that this official theory was disproved in the Memorandum submitted to Mr. Fowler last summer by the Indian Parliamentary Committee, and that Sir Auckland Colvin, who was formerly Finance Minister, agrees with the conclusions of this Memorandum. But it is pleasant to find that there was at least one righteous man in Mr. Balfour's meeting.

Commenting on Mr. Balfour's facing-both-ways speech, the *St. James's Gazette* said: At Manchester yesterday Mr. Balfour, speaking on the Indian cotton duties, was cautious—too cautious. As a rule, there is no mistaking what he means. He speaks straight and clearly, and does not leave his intentions in any sort of doubt. But this time he is unusually diplomatic. He believes in bimetallism as the only permanent remedy for Indian difficulties; but bimetallism is not for the moment a practical issue. He "believes the Government have made an honest effort to carry out a very ungrateful task in the least injurious way." But this qualified approval was fenced in by all sorts of reservations and limitations, which would leave it quite open to Mr. Balfour to attack the Government's "honest effort" instead of supporting it later on. On the whole, it looks as if our leader were still sitting on the fence. We hope, and on the whole believe, that he intends to come down on the right side; but his speech yesterday leaves us in some doubt still.

Commenting on Lord Brassey's appointment to the Governorship of Victoria, the *Daily News* says that the Secretary of State for the Colonies is fortunate in the selection which he has been able to make. Lord Brassey is a man who makes himself popular wherever he goes. He has been everywhere and seen everything. He succeeds to an important post at a rather critical moment. The finances of Victoria are not in the most flourishing condition, and severe economy is, to use a cant phase, the order of the day in the Colony. Mr. Turner's Government, having proposed to reduce the salaries of members from three hundred to two hundred pounds, was defeated in the Legislative Assembly on a motion for adjournment. But a compromise was afterwards arranged, and a smaller reduction was adopted by the casting vote of the chairman. At the same time it was agreed that the Governor's salary should be cut down from ten to five thousand a year. This is a serious matter for future Governors, unless indeed the change is only a temporary remedy for a passing phase of depression. For the Governor is expected to dispense a generous hospitality, and it is said that the larger sum does not cover the outlay he has hitherto been compelled to incur.

In these circumstances Lord Brassey's great wealth is no disqualification for the duties he will have to discharge. His predecessor, Lord Hopetoun, retires from office with the best wishes of all classes in

Victoria, where he is universally liked and esteemed. When he proposed to return rather more than a year ago, having apparently assumed that his official tenure was for five years, instead of, as it is, for six the Colonial Secretary, though a political opponent, cordially requested him to remain. Lord Ripon has now found the right man for the place, and Lord Brassey escapes from the incongruous position of a Lord-in-Waiting which he accepted at the special request of Mr. Gladstone. The Governor of a Colony which enjoys representative institutions has little responsibility and less power. He is in the hands of his Ministers, whose advice he must follow whatever he thinks of it. He still possesses the right of withholding his assent from Bills, and of reserving them for the opinion of the Colonial Office. He can confer the honour of knighthood and exercise the prerogative of mercy. But the real work of Colonial politics is done by men over whom he has no more authority than the Secretary of State at home. It is in social matters that the Governor can smooth the wheels, and there Lord Brassey's geniality will have full play.

Professor F. Max Müller received a handsome Christmas-box from India. It was a beautiful silver casket of Indian repoussé work, in the form of a manuscript, with allegorical embellishments, and it contained an address with sheets of signatures, including the best known names not only of Hindus, but of Muhammadans, Parsis, and of civil servants from every Presidency, in honour of, and gratitude for, his distinguished services to the literature of their country. The Pandits make special reference to Mr. Max Müller's edition of their ancient Bible, the Rig Veda, which had never been published before, even in India, and to the forty or fifty volumes of translations of the Sacred Books of the East which have been brought out under his editorship. By these works, they say, "a conviction has been generated and strengthened that God's ennobling and elevating truth is not the monopoly of any particular race, and a strong impetus has been given to a unifying movement among the religions of the world."

RELIGIOUS RIOTS IN INDIA.

MEMORIAL OF THE POONA SARVAJANIK SABHA.

The following important memorial has been addressed by the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha to the Secretary to the Government of Bombay. It is signed by Mr. G. K. Gokhale, Hon. Sec. of the Sarvajanik Sabha:—

Sir,—I have been directed by the Managing Committee of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha to submit, for the consideration of his Excellency the Governor in Council, the following representation on the subject of the unhappy relations which have prevailed for some time past between the lower classes of Hindus and Muhammadans in Poona, Sholapur, Belgaum, Ahmednugger, Satara, Wai, Yeola, Ratnagherry, Raver, Chiplun, Pen, Kalyan, and other places in the Deccan, and to request that Government will be pleased to take such steps and issue such orders as may appear to it best suited, in view of the considerations suggested below, to remove all cause for the existing misunderstanding and to restore the old amicable relations between the two communities.

2. The committee of the Sabha, composed as it is of representatives of the Hindu, Muhummadan, and Parsi communities, advisedly refrained hitherto from memorialising the Government in the matter, because of its anxiety to avoid even the remotest appearance of taking sides with either party in these disputes and such a misconception of its position would possibly have arisen as long as the excitement caused by the disturbances precluded any fair and impartial consideration of the true issue involved in these unhappy quarrels. And accordingly the efforts of the committee have for some time past been confined only to private mediation in the interests of peace and mutual forbearance and good will. The committee, besides, has all along had full confidence that Government was both anxious and able to hold the balance evenly between the two parties. The committee, however, now think that the time has come when it might, with advantage, consider the subject in all its bearings, and suggest the adoption of permanent remedial measures calculated to re-establish the old harmony between the two communities and prevent a recurrence of such unfortunate riots.

3. These animosities, though they have latterly assumed a dangerous character, have not come to the surface during the past twelve months only. Towards the close of the administration of Lord Reay there were serious disturbances between Hindus and Muhammadans in Sholapur and Belgaum. A punitive police force was in consequence established at Sholapur for a year, and the same measure had to be adopted at Belgaum in the last year of Lord Reay's tenure of office; and one of the first acts of H. E. Lord Harris was associated with the removal of the punitive force at Belgaum. It is necessary to keep this previous history in mind to understand clearly why the strained relations between the two communities have of late shown such morbid and unhealthy development. As a matter of fact, this development has not been entirely due to causes confined to this presidency. The strained relations between the two communities in other parts of India, notably in Burma, Bengal, and the North-West Provinces, leading at times to outbreaks of religious bigotry, in connection with the question of cow-slaughter, have been responsible, in no small measure, for the unsettling of old relations between Hindus and Muhammadans in this part of India. It is true that the cow-question has not directly caused any trouble in this presidency, but the reflected action of the excitement over the question in North and East India has affected the social atmosphere even here, inasmuch as the sympathies of the two communities are naturally with their respective co-religionists in other parts of the country. The Prabhas-Patan disturbances, which were, for the most part, a one-sided affair, came in next for a share of the responsibility for increasing the bitterness of feeling between the two communities. It was the excitement caused by these disturbances which, in effect, led to the serious riots which oc-

curred in Bombay in August, 1893, and which were attended with such heavy destruction of life and property. In these Bombay riots the provocation and retaliation assumed such proportions that, even after peace had been re-established, bitter memories of the conflict were left behind; and owing to the intimate relations which Bombay has with all the towns in the mofussil, the feeling of hatred between the lower classes of the two communities which grew up in Bombay, extended to many places in the mofussil. It was thus that the ground was prepared for these religious disturbances in the mofussil, and the question of music in public streets, especially in connection with religious ceremonies and processions, which has now assumed such extraordinary and pressing importance, served in reality the purpose of only an immediate cause for these deplorable outbreaks. It will now serve no useful purpose to describe in detail the provocation and the retaliation in connection with these outbreaks, or to apportion in any way the blame or responsibility for them. Both the official and non-official accounts of these disturbances are before Government, and the committee of the Sabha cannot hope to make any material addition to them by any information in its possession.

4. These official and non-official accounts have, however, clearly brought out certain features common to all these disturbances, which it is well to note here briefly:—

I. These disturbances have never had the character of being anything more than disturbances between the lower orders of the two communities. Barring perhaps a very few exceptions, no respectable Hindus or Muhammadans have taken part in or sympathised with them.

II. The misunderstandings have had no other than a religious root. The dispute has been solely between two sections of the ruled, and in no way whatever between the rulers and the ruled. As a matter of fact, both parties to the quarrel have looked up to Government to support their claims, and the idea entertained in certain quarters that the disturbances have had other than a religious origin has caused much irritation and disappointment. In the Bombay riots the police sought to fasten the responsibility on the Cow Protection Society, but fortunately the Government did not accept this view, and later on Sir Dinshaw Petit, President of the Society, satisfactorily showed that that Society could not be responsible for any soreness of feeling, especially because a number of Muhammadans were heartily co-operating with the Hindus in its work. In the mofussil disturbances a similar attempt has been made to throw the blame on certain members of the native press, who are charged with the intention of discrediting authority and setting class against class for selfish purposes. This tendency to transfer responsibility to the wrong quarters has misdirected the energies of the lower district police and executive authorities, and though the action of the judicial authorities in Poona, Nasick, and Belgaum has tended greatly to reassure the public mind, some time must elapse before the deplorable results of the unwarrantable attitude taken up by the lower police and executive officers entirely disappear. In this connection the committee of the Sabha feels bound to state that the currency which the misconceptions noted above obtained owing to the support which they seemingly found in one or two of H.E. the Governor's recent speeches has caused the greatest pain to the people of the Deccan, and the committee would be wanting in its duty if it failed to record its respectful but emphatic protest against the severe condemnation passed by his Excellency upon a whole people whose respect for law and love of order have never been questioned before.

III. Another and a most important feature of these disturbances that deserves notice is that they were all connected with the use of music required by the Hindus for their religious ceremonies and processions. Even in the Bombay riots the ringing of bells in a temple situated near the Jumma Musjid was ostensibly put forward as the immediate cause of the outbreak. At Poona, Yeola, Wai, and other places, it was the use of music in religious processions which led to the disturbances. It is important to note this peculiarity because the police authorities appeared to have throughout confounded this music, which may be called religious music, with other music which may be called secular music, and which is used in marriage processions and other social functions of pomp and show; and in the opinion of the Sabha the difficulties of the present situation are in no small measure due to this confusion. Secular music, it may be stated, is always hired for the occasion, and the party of hired musicians consists of both Hindus and Muhammadans. On account of its noisy character the municipal laws have claimed a right to control this music, and its use in street processions is subject to a license, for which a fee has to be paid. Religious music, on the other hand, is like bells and organs in Christian churches: in the first place, not noisy; secondly, it is never hired but always volunteered; and, thirdly, no claim has ever been made to regulate it by licenses or fees. The police authorities in Poona, Wai, and elsewhere have unfortunately not borne this distinction in mind, and have tried to enforce in respect of religious music, *i.e.*, soft music, voluntarily played by devotees, regulations which were never intended for any other than the noisy music of hired musicians. This fatal mistake has been at the bottom of all the irritation which has been felt by the Hindu community all over the Deccan, and the irritation has been aggravated tenfold by indiscriminate prosecutions under the Police Act of respectable gentlemen, under the mistaken notion that such prosecutions and punishments would strengthen the authority of the lower executive and police officers. The Hindu population in this part of India, as in others, is peculiarly sensitive in the matter of any interference with its religious services, and so long as this distinction which the committee of the Sabha has sought to bring to the notice of Government is not adequately recognised and due allowance made for it, the feeling of soreness which has arisen will continue to prove a source of bad feeling between the two communities and of serious anxiety to Government.

IV. It is not necessary to trace this irritation to anything deeper than what appears on the surface. Under the influence of equal protection of the laws both Hindus and Muhammadans have begun to feel that the old customary restraints upon their freedom should disappear and give place to other standards of social equality. This is perhaps an unavoidable incident of the transition through which the country is passing, but the change requires to be guided gently and with tact and judgment, and repressive measures are about the worst course that can be adopted under the circumstances. In the early years of British rule high district officers did not, as now, keep aloof from the people, but kept up with them other than purely official relations. In disputes like the present purely official relations are powerless for good, and it is unfortunate that these old traditions of mixing with the people have now been so completely abandoned. This break in the continuity of the past order of things accounts for much of the misunderstanding which at present unhappily prevails between the district officers and the people. A resort to stern repression as the only remedy for the present lamentable state of things practically amounts to an abnegation of the higher moral power which the British rule represents, and can never be depended upon to achieve permanent success. Repressive measures and punitive police posts are out of place in restoring peace and friendly relations, and indiscriminate punishments tend only to aggravate the feeling of irritation and the sense of injustice.

5. This diagnosis of the social malady which has, like an epidemic, affected so many places, furnishes, in the opinion of the committee, suggestions as to the best method of treatment. The fact that the disturbances are confined to the lower classes of the two communities suggests, in the first instance, that the help of the leading members of these communities should be more freely and unreservedly sought than has yet been attempted in this presidency. Government expects these leaders to settle these differences among themselves and, at the same time, clothes them with no authority which its officers are bound to recognise. The committee of the Sabha begs leave to submit that no settlement is possible under these conditions. The leaders are powerless after the disturbances have broken out, for then reckless and violent-tempered men come up to the surface to lead the lower orders temporarily during the period of excitement. For real use the help of sober and sensible leaders should be sought as soon as causes making for a disturbance are perceived to be at work. If district officers are held responsible for the preservation of peace within their jurisdiction, and degraded or promoted as they fail or succeed in preserving it, they will naturally seek to enlist the active co-operation of the leaders of both sides. When these leaders, no longer meeting the district officers as irresponsible individuals or as private informers against each other, are thus brought together for purposes of responsible deliberation and action, and when they feel the assurance that their suggestions will be accepted and their efforts supported by the officers of Government, they may be depended upon to arrive at a settlement of the difficulties which it will be impossible for the lower orders to set at nought. The present system of regarding the voluntary representations of leaders with violent prejudice and mistrust and of relying too exclusively on the secret reports of unscrupulous and low-paid police spies, interested in manufacturing sensational news, is in the highest degree unfair to men who have at least as great a stake in the preservation of peace as any police officer, but who cannot come forward even to prevent disturbances for fear that their conduct might be misconstrued and misreported by the police, thereby involving them in needless and undeserved difficulties. In every town there are always to be found some Hindus whom the Muhammadans respect and Muhammadans who enjoy the confidence of the Hindus. At present, these men have simply to shut themselves up in their houses, full of feelings of sorrow and helplessness, as any action that they may take is liable to be misconstrued or misrepresented by the police. Boards of such men, formed at the initiation of district officers and duly supported by them, will be able to achieve great good and go far to control the disorderly elements. This is not a mere matter of speculation. In the N.-W. Provinces the local government has formed such boards, and the success which their work has attained, amidst greater difficulties than have to be faced in this presidency, has been acknowledged in terms of approbation and satisfaction by Sir Charles Crosthwaite.

6. It is often urged that it is impossible for Government to ascertain and lay down custom everywhere in the Presidency as regards processions and the use of music in connection with them. H.E. the Governor himself stated the other day that at Yeola Government had tried to ascertain the custom by consulting Hindu and Muhammadan officers on the subject, but that the testimony was so conflicting that no conclusion could be drawn therefrom. Such a conflict was, however, to be expected, and the committee of the Sabha submits that the mere difficulty of a necessary task cannot justify its abandonment. A conflict of evidence is not confined to such disputes only. Experience shows that judges have to face this difficulty every day, and they face it with the help of rules regarding the burden of proof, self-serving and self-deserving evidence, and probabilities. The places where the disturbances have occurred are not too many, and if a judicial officer is specially appointed by Government to do the work it cannot be impossible for him to ascertain the truth. If conciliation boards, on the lines suggested above, are appointed, they could also render great assistance to Government in the matter, and when the problem is once thus faced it will not after all be found to be so difficult of solution as it may at first sight appear.

7. The committee of the Sabha, however, thinks that it is not necessary to undertake this task of setting the custom except in a few places. The policy of Government in these matters has been already authoritatively enunciated by the late Viceroy, Lord Lansdowne, namely, that the religious prejudices of both the communities are to be respected, without imposing any unnecessary or undue hardship on either; and all that is wanted is that Government should require that that policy shall be kept steadily in view by the lower district and the police officers in dealing with all questions that may arise. In this connection one or two general principles may be referred to here with advantage. It

is necessary that all rules intended to regulate music on occasions of religious services and processions should unequivocally recognise the fact that the regulation is to be in respect of time and kinds of music only, and must not go to the length of stopping all music and thereby destroying its continuous character. If certain classes object to street processions passing by their public places of worship with music, while they are engaged in worship, this feeling should be respected not by forbidding all music at all times while passing those places, but by stopping all loud and noisy music likely to disturb worship, during prescribed hours of worship. This point was unfortunately lost sight of in the rules which have been recently promulgated in Poona and Wai and which have caused so much heart-burning. There is a real and distinct difference between the music, played by devotees in public religious processions, and the loud music used on secular occasions by private individuals for purposes of pomp. A demand on grounds of courtesy may well be made and will be readily responded to in the latter case, because there are no religious considerations involved. But in the case of religious music the people are very sensitive, and any attempt to stop it altogether for howsoever short a time or distance is bitterly resented as an interference with their religious observances, as it is believed by them that a breach in the continuity of music destroys nearly all the merit of their procession. The people at Wai, for instance, yielded to the notification issued by the District Magistrate the maximum amount of obedience that was consistent with the necessary minimum of regard for the religious necessities of their processions. They stopped all hired and loud music and even all the religious music of the devotees except a small pair of cymbals which alone they kept on striking to keep up the continuity of their music. Nothing more could reasonably be expected of them by way of concession or obedience, and yet, though the police did not interfere with the procession at the time, some of the best men of the place were dragged before the Assistant Collector—a young and inexperienced Civilian—and harshly sentenced to three or four weeks of imprisonment each! The Police Act itself requires that the regulations and directions issued by the district authorities shall be reasonable. European officers, not being in touch with the people, are unable to understand their religious prejudice and cannot properly fix this margin of reasonableness; and unhappy consequences result, as in Wai, from the orders which they think proper to issue. The committee of the Sabha, therefore, respectively requests that Government will be pleased to issue general directions for the guidance of district officers in this matter, which will leave them a very limited margin of discretion. The principal point to be secured is that the authority of Government should be used to prevent outbreaks rather than that it should become necessary to resort to stern repression to put them down after they have broken out.

8. There is one more suggestion which the committee of the Sabha deems it to be its duty to make for the consideration of Government. The Police Act confers large powers on district magistrates and police superintendents to regulate processions and such other matters. When the Bill was under consideration in the local legislative council, the attention of Government was drawn by the Hon. Mr. Justice Ranade, who was then a member of the Council, to the fact that these large powers were liable to be seriously abused owing chiefly to the ignorance of native customs on the part of district authorities, and that such abuse was sure to lead to most undesirable consequences. Sir Raymond West, who had charge of the Bill, thereupon stated that he proposed to provide against the dangers by the insertion of the word "reasonable" in the sections giving power to the district authorities to make rules under the Act. The hon. member was of opinion that the insertion of that word would make the rules amenable to the control of the civil courts. As a matter of fact, however the civil courts are found to be open only in the case of rules made by district magistrates. No such remedy is open in the case of the rules made by the police department, for the High Court has held that in regard to these it has no jurisdiction to interfere. And when magistrates punish the breaches of these rules within their authority as was done at Wai there is no appeal and practically no revision. The police officers are thus untrammelled by any check, except the check of the department and of the Government which, again, does not come into operation till long after the mischief has been done. The committee of the Sabha, therefore, suggests that the rules made by district magistrates and police superintendents under sections 44 and 48 of the Police Act should, under departmental orders, first be submitted to Government for sanction and should also whenever practicable, be published by Government in draft form so as to enable the public to submit whatever objections they may have to urge. This would impose a much-needed check on the action of police superintendents, in the absence of any amendment of the Police Act. The remedy of the civil courts, even where it is available, must always be tardy and expensive, and liable to technical failures, and besides is not of much use in adjusting strained relations.

9. In the absence of general directions and the departmental check suggested above, the rules promulgated by the district police and executive officers in Poona and Wai have worked great mischief. The rules, for instance, promulgated by Major Macpherson in this city, have been framed in such astounding ignorance of Hindu customs that it is difficult to realise that they have been issued by a responsible officer of Government. Numerous occasions arise in Hindu families of a most pressing character which require the immediate use of music, and it is preposterous to expect a notice of three days in respect of them. Similarly, some of the processions are regulated by astrological considerations which are independent of particular hours of day or night, and cannot be put off. The rule, therefore, which stops all music after 11 p.m., must cause an inconceivable amount of hardship, especially after the season of marriage ceremonies has commenced. Further, these rules have invaded not only public streets, but also private houses standing by these

streets. There are several other grave objections to these rules, but the committee of the Sabha does not deem it necessary to state them here, as it has already appointed a deputation to represent the hardships caused by them to the acting District Superintendent of Police, who, it is hoped, will show greater regard for native customs than his predecessor chose to do. But there is one point in connection with these and similar other rules which the committee of the Sabha is anxious to press upon the attention of Government. The power to legislate in matters affecting the religious practices of the people has been expressly confined by Parliament to the Supreme Legislative Council. It could, therefore, never have been intended that district and executive police officers should, by rules framed under local Acts, do that which the local legislature itself is unable to enact. The committee, therefore, suggests that matters relating to religious processions and the use of music before temples and mosques, should be, by an amendment of the law, specially exempted from interference by police authorities.

10. To sum up. The committee has pointed out that the principal common features of the disturbances are:—

(1) That they are confined only to the lower classes of the two communities.

(2) That they all owe their origin to religious prejudices, and religious prejudices only.

(3) That in this Presidency the misunderstanding has been chiefly due to the attempt made by district authorities to subject religious music to the same restrictions as secular music used on occasions of pomp and show.

(4) And that the conflict is perhaps a necessary incident of the transition through which the country is passing, old customary restraints gradually giving place to new standards of social equality.

The remedies suggested by the committee of the Sabha are:—

(1) The enlistment of the active co-operation of the leaders of the two communities in removing misunderstandings and adjusting differences before disturbances have actually broken out.

(2) The appointment of conciliation boards of the two communities in places where disturbances have occurred or are apprehended.

(3) A less exclusive reliance on police reports, based chiefly on information supplied by low-paid and not over-scrupulous officers.

(4) A return on the part of the district officers to the old traditions of keeping with the people other than purely official relations.

(5) The ascertainment of custom by entrusting the work to a judicial officer in places where the misunderstanding has assumed an aggravated form.

(6) And the laying down of general principles by Government for the guidance of district officers insisting that the distinction between religious and secular music should be adequately borne in mind in framing rules,—that religious music, that is, the voluntary music of devotees should be treated apart from the loud and hired music used on secular occasions, and should in no case be stopped altogether.

The committee has also suggested that the rules framed by district officers in regard to these matters should be required by a departmental order to be submitted to Government for approval and sanction, and, wherever practicable, opportunity should be given to the public to state their objections to them before their final promulgation. Lastly, the committee has requested an amendment of the Police Act so as to exclude questions connected with religious processions and the use of music before temples and mosques from police interference.

11. The unfortunate tension between Hindus and Muhammadans, which began in Belgaum and Sholapur in Lord Reay's time, has now assumed such a serious character and has become so general that Government can no longer afford to leave it to work its mischief and find its own cure. The Sabha knows that the Government is animated, in all that it does, by the sole desire of preserving peace; and it confidently appeals to H. E. Lord Harris to take effective steps for removing the present misunderstanding between the two communities. No doubt his Excellency's term of office is now about to terminate, but if the few months that yet remain are utilised in taking the measures suggested above, the committee feels confident that a great deal would be done. A special officer with large sympathies may well be deputed to visit the places where disturbances have broken out or are apprehended, and assist Government in arriving at a satisfactory settlement of this great difficulty. If this is done and fair progress thereby made in healing up these sores, his Excellency will have conferred upon the people of this presidency a great and richly-prized blessing.

Correspondence.

LORD BRASSEY ON INDIA.

To the Editor of "INDIA."

SIR,—In a paper which Lord Brassey read on the 15th inst. before the Scottish Society of Literature and Arts in Glasgow, he said, in reply to the question whether our rule was popular in India, that "the Muhammadans had never been, and could never be, fully reconciled to the condition of subordination to a Christian power." Assuming the correctness of this opinion, it might well be asked, then what advantage does our Government expect from the absorption in our Indian Empire of the tribal territories extending along our North-West frontier, which are entirely inhabited by Muhammadans of perhaps the most fanatical type in the world? That any financial advantage may be reaped from the enterprise is, of course, out of the question, seeing that the country is too barren and too poor to repay the cost of conquest or to bear the expense of a military occupation. A plea was put forward eighteeen years ago that a partial occupation of Afghanistan was necessary for the defence of the Indian frontier against a Russian attack. That plea served for a time to conceal the real character of the policy of conquest which led to the ill-fated invasion of Afghanistan in November, 1878; but its hollowness has long been exposed, and "the time has come," as Lord Brassey justly observed, "when the bugbear of Russian aggression should be put aside."

Meanwhile the Government are exasperating our Indian fellow-subjects with oppressive taxation, in order to find means for subjugating the Muhammadan tribes who dwell beyond our frontier. These military operations, which have already been carried on for eighteen years, have signally failed throughout; and if success should eventually be encompassed (of which there is, however, no prospect at present) the effect would be to add a hostile and turbulent element to the population of our Indian Empire, and seriously aggravate the difficulties of our rule in India.

A circumstance which should not be overlooked is that, by applying Indian revenue to wars beyond the Indian frontier, the Government are violating a most important clause of Act 106 of 1858, by which Parliament provided for the better government of India. This circumstance may have been in Lord Brassey's mind when he said on the above-mentioned occasion: "The military charges in India have been advancing in proportions which would scarcely have been permitted if the Administration had been conducted under Parliamentary control."

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
London, 20th Jan. J. Dacosta.

"A PROTEST AGAINST RAILWAY EXTENSION IN INDIA."

To the Editor of "India."

Sir,—In condemning canals has "R. B." any idea of the wonderful property of water in modifying climate? If water has the effect of influencing the rainfall, then why should the waters of the Gogra and other magnificent snow-fed streams be allowed to run waste, instead of being properly utilised? "R. B." should study the effect that water has had on a dry country like Egypt. I could give him some remarkable facts connected with India, as I managed a canal for some years in that country. I had better give a few quotations from Dr. Bernard Dyer's little book ("Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs") to explain to your readers my reasons for condemning the exportation of oil seeds, and also for advocating an improved system of cotton cultivation in India:

"Albuminoids are absolutely necessary for the building up of muscle, bone, and tendon, for the production of calves, and for making the curd of milk.

"The following is a short classification of well-known feeding stuffs" (all of which are produced in India):

"1. *Very Rich in Albuminoids.*—Decorticated cotton cake and earth-nut cake (45 to 50 per cent.).

"2. *Rich in Albuminoids.*—Linseed cake and rape cake (25 to 35 per cent.).

"3. *Moderately Rich in Albuminoids.*—Undecorticated cotton cake, beans, and peas (20 to 25 per cent.).

"4. *Poor in Albuminoids.*—Wheat, oats, barley, maize, rice, millet (10 to 15 per cent.).

"The value of the manure produced by feeding these various materials is according to the albuminoids in them, since it is the nitrogen contained in the albuminoids that yields nitrogen or 'ammonia' in the manure."

Are not these sufficient reasons for the development of cotton cultivation and for the retention of oil seeds in India? But "R. B." will probably maintain that Dr. Bernard Dyer and all other scientists (excuse the word) are wrong in their conclusions. The condition of Indian cattle will, however, prove how true the statements are which I have just quoted. Pauperism and a low state of health among the masses are the results of the present system.

The cultivation of wheat is principally confined to the Punjab, North-West Provinces, Oudh, the Central Provinces, Bombay, Berar, and Behar. The Beharis are therefore wheat-eating people; and the chairman of the Bengal and North-Western Railway informed the shareholders of his company at their last meeting that "the principal features in the goods traffic were defective rice crops in Tirkut, with a large production of wheat in the Punjab and a slack export trade to Europe. Hence wheat had come from the Punjab to the districts they served to replace the deficient rice, and their export wheat trade had for the time all but ceased." A very good thing, too, in my humble opinion, as in the year 1886 50,000 tons of wheat were exported from the congested districts of Behar, Gorakhpur, and Busti by the Bengal and North-Western railway. This was exacting the pound of flesh with a vengeance, as a brisk export trade in food-grains makes the grain dealer master of the situation in an Indian village. The rayats suffer untold hardships by all their principal food-grains being bought up and stored at harvest time by money-lenders and traders.

Although I am a staunch Tory, with very little sympathy for the present Government, yet I blushed with shame when I read the letters on Indian railways in the *Times* from Sir James Kitson and Mr. Fowler. In the interests of India can nothing better be thought of than grinding the faces of the poor and exhausting the agriculture of the country?

Yours, etc.,
Donald N. Reid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

(*Extracted from the* "Review of Reviews,")
WITH ADDITIONS.

JANUARY, 1895.

Forum (Edward Arnold). Telang, P. R., "Christian Missions as Seen by a Brahman."

Gentleman's Magazine (Chatto and Windus). Walker, E. O., "In the Indian Jungle."

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). "Ratanbai: A Sketch of a Bombay School Girls' Home Life."

New Review (Wm. Heinemann). Keary, C. F., "India: Impressions."

Nineteenth Century (Sampson Low). Logan, Mrs., "Night Travelling in India."

United Service Magazine (13, Charing Cross). Wilberforce, Mr., "Mutiny Myths"; "The Indian Army: The New Organisation."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

(*Extracted from the* "Publishers' Circular.")
WITH ADDITIONS.

JANUARY, 1895.

Carus, Paul……"The Gospel of Buddha, According to Old Records" ……………………	6s. 0d.
Macmillan, Michael, B.A.……"The Globe Trotter in India Two Hundred Years Ago, and other Indian Studies." (Swan Sonnenschein)….	4s. 6d.
Lloyd, T.……"Bimetallism Examined." (*Statist* Press, Cannon Street) …………………	2s. 6d.
Rea, Alex.……"Archæological Survey of India"—New Imperial Series, Vol. XV.—"South Indian Buddhist Antiquities" …………	Rs. 10.
Vol. XVII.—"List of Architectural and Archæological Remains in Coorg." (Madras: Superintendent, Government Press) ……..	Ans. 8.
Malabari, Behramji, M.……"The Indian Problem." (Bombay: The Eagle Printing Press) ……………………………	——
Phillips, Maurice……"The Teaching of the Vedas." (Longmans, Green and Co.)……	6s. 0d.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, FEBRUARY, 1895.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF CIVIL AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN INDIA.

BY PARBATI C. ROY, B.A.[1]

The most noticeable feature in the British rule of India is its legislative activity. If mere laws could make a Government perfect then the English Government in India might be said to be all that could be desired. At first these laws were made by the Governor-General alone; then a Council was added to help him. Now, in addition to this Imperial Council, every Governor and Lieutenant-Governor has one in each Province, and not a year passes which does not see many enactments added to the Statute Book. In fact, it is a question at the present moment with many thoughtful Englishmen whether, along with other evils, India does not suffer from those of over-legislation. It is, however, not the object of this article to discuss how the over-flooding of India with laws is affecting the people of that country, but how those laws are being administered.

It is the universal practice with all civilised Governments to appoint none but trained lawyers to administer justice in the courts. In India, however, this rule is not observed in the appointment of civilians as judges and magistrates. A civilian does not pass any examination in law at the open competition, and though his knowledge of revenue and criminal laws is tested subsequently, it is never tested in the case of civil laws. When, therefore, a civilian is promoted to a District Judgeship from a Joint Magistracy, and sometimes even from an Assistant Magistracy, after he has been for only four or five years in the country, he brings with him no knowledge of civil laws, and still he exercises large civil powers. He tries original civil suits of any value, and decides "miscellaneous" cases of all descriptions; hears appeals from decrees passed by Munsiffs (lowest grade Civil Judges, exercising jurisdiction similar to County Court jurisdiction in England), and by Subordinate Judges when the value of the decree passed by the latter does not exceed Rs. 5,000. The evils of such a system are self-evident, and it is no wonder that the parties appearing before these judges have little confidence in them. It is not often that Anglo-Indians raise their voice against this system, which does not affect them other than beneficially, the judges being their own countrymen. Sometimes, however, in the course of conversation with their fellow-countrymen they throw away the reserve. The most recent instance of lifting up the veil is furnished by a correspondent of *Black and White*, to whom at an interview Sir Charles Paul, the Advocate-General of Bengal, is reported to have remarked:—

> "It is a mistake in these advanced days to appoint civilians to high judicial posts, which ought to be filled up by properly trained and thoroughly experienced barristers and pleaders. What can an ordinary civil servant, however intelligent and well educated he may be, know of the tremendous complications and the innumerable technicalities of a mixture of English, Hindu, and Muhammadan law? We have a number of codes all of a strictly technical character, based principally on English law. Now it often happens that sectional orders issued by Government do not clearly and expressly state the law on the points to which they refer. It is taken for granted that the administrator—judge or magistrate—knows the law; but he frequently, being a civilian, does not know it. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, for men who have to construe these sections to be acquainted with the *principles* on which they are founded. It is hopeless to expect men, merely by the light of nature, to arrive at a proper interpretation of these sections. Many years of extensive practice, and a long familiarity with principles and cases, will alone fit a man for so great a task. I would here particularise the frequent unfamiliarity and want of acquaintance on the part of all *non-professional judges* with the law of evidence. Points of law which arise in the course of the examination of witnesses require to be readily decided. I do not think that under our present system there is sufficient ability or enlightenment for that purpose."

That the Government is not unaware of this defect in its administration will appear from the following spasmodic efforts made by it in 1880-82 to give to junior members of the Civil Service in Bengal electing the judicial branch a training in the trial of civil cases.

> "Two important measures for the improvement of the judicial administration of the province were matured during the year, and have since its close been partially carried out. The object of one of the measures is to provide a good judicial training for all Covenanted Civilians who elect the judicial branch of the Service and to remove the anomaly under which, since the separation of the Service into two distinct branches, civilians of eleven or twelve years' standing have often been called upon to hear, as judges, criminal appeals from District Magistrates and civil appeals from Subordinate Judges of twenty years' service, without having themselves ever heard a single criminal appeal or a single civil suit."[1]

---

[1] Late Police Magistrate, Alipur, Calcutta, and Late Subordinate Judge, Darjiling.

[1] "Bengal Administration Report for 1880-81," p. 2.

"The scheme for training the young covenanted officers for the judicial branch of the Service by vesting them with civil powers was still on its trial throughout the year, but it has occasioned a greater amount of inconvenience than is at all commensurate with the advantage to be expected from it, and it will probably have to be largely modified before long.[1]

"The scheme for training junior officers of the Covenanted Civil Service who had elected the judicial branch of the Service in the judicial work, by vesting them with powers of a civil court, has, after three years' trial, been pronounced a failure by the High Court, and its abandonment recommended."[2]

The attempt was given up as inconvenient, presumably because it was distasteful to the young civilians to learn civil work until they had risen to the top of the ladder. And therefore so long as none but civilians can hold the post of District Judge, the Indians must content themselves with receiving justice at the hands of judges ignorant of the civil laws of the country and inexperienced in their working.

The question, however, is not one of mere inefficiency. It is one of very great financial importance as well. As regards the trial of "original suits," of "appeals" from the decision of Munsiffs, and of most of the "miscellaneous" cases, the Subordinate Judge exercises the same jurisdiction as the District Judge. But while the average salary of a Subordinate Judge in Rs. 700, that of the District Judge is Rs. 2,250, or in other words the latter is paid more than three times the former for doing almost the same work. The appeals from their own decisions in suits not exceeding Rs. 5,000 which the Subordinate Judges cannot try form but a very small fraction of the entire number of appeals preferred to the District Judges.

The administration of civil justice will not in the least suffer if the Civilian Judges are replaced by the Subordinate Judges, regarding whose character and efficiency the following testimony is borne by Lord Chancellor Selborne and by Sir Charles Paul, whose opinion about the inefficiency of Civilian Judges has already been quoted.

Lord SELBORNE: My Lords, for some years I practised in Indian cases before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and during those years there were few cases of any imperial importance in which I was not concerned. I had considerable opportunities of observing the manner in which, in civil cases, the native judges did their duty, and I have no hesitation in saying—and I know this was also the opinion of the judges during that time—that the judgments of the native judges bore most favourable comparison, as a general rule, with the judgments of the English judges. I should be sorry to say anything in disparagement of English judges, who, as a class, are most anxious carefully to discharge their duty; but I repeat that I have no hesitation in saying that in every instance, in respect of integrity, of learning, of knowledge, of the soundness and satisfactory character of the judgments arrived at, the native judgments were quite as good as those of English judges.[3]

Sir CHARLES PAUL: They (the natives) make excellent civil judges.[4]

The next points for consideration are: (1) What reduction could be effected in the number of the *present* judges if they were relieved of their civil duties, and (2) what increase would be necessary in the staff of subordinate judges in order to discharge the additional work which would devolve on them by this arrangement.

It appears from the Calcutta High Courts' Return, P. 1 ("Work done by District Judges") that the average number of days spent by each District Judge in the regulation districts was 146 on civil work against 112 on criminal in 1884, and 142 against 117 in 1892. It will thus be seen that on an average more than half the number of days was spent on civil work by the District Judges. If the present District Judges were relieved of their civil duties each of them could perform twice as much criminal work as at present, and have at least 25 days to spare.

There were in Bengal on the 1st of April, 1894, 30 District and additional judges, besides the Judicial Commissioner of Chutia Nagpur. The criminal work now done by the District Judges could be done by half of this number, who would still have (25 × 15 =) 375 days for trying civil appeals. It has been said that the number of appeals triable by the District Judges only was small.

In 1881, "out of 19,792 appeals, the District and Subordinate Judges were both competent to try 19,311, or 97·6 per cent. In the remainder, *i.e.* 481 cases, or 2·4 per cent., the appeal lay only to the District Judge, the court of first instance being the Subordinate Judge."[1]

In 1882, "out of 19,501 appeals, the District and Subordinate Judges were both competent to try 18,937, or 97·1 per cent. In the remainder (*i.e.*, 564 cases), or in 2·9 per cent., the appeal lay only to the District Judge, the court of first instance being the Subordinate Judge."[2]

In 1883, "of 17,457 appeals, 17,009 (or 98·1 per cent.) were triable either by District or Subordinate Judges. In the remainder (*i.e.*, 448 cases) the Subordinate Judges were the courts of first instance, and the appeals lay, therefore, to the District Judge."[3]

In 1884, "of 18,432 appeals, 17,998 (or 97·6 per cent.), were triable either by District or Subordinate Judges. In the remainder (*i.e.*, 434 cases) the Subordinate Judges were the courts of first instance, and the appeal lay, therefore, to the District Judge."[4]

In 1892, "of 21,554 appeals, 21,103 (or 97·9 per cent.) were triable either by District or Subordinate Judges. In the remaining cases (*i.e.*, 451) Subordinate Judges were the courts of first instance, and appeals therefrom lay to District Judges."[5]

It will appear from the above extracts that the number of appeals triable *only by District Judges* generally varies from 400 to 500 a year. These appeals could be tried within the 375 spare days referred to above by fifteen judges.

If, however, an addition of one judge were made to this number, the sixteen judges would be able not only to try all the criminal cases now tried by the District Judges and all the appeals from the decisions of Subordinate Judges, the number of which will be greatly reduced under the present scheme (as will appear from the sequel), but would also have ample time left for supervising the civil courts under them. Each of these sixteen judges will have jurisdiction over two or more districts according to the amount of work to be done, and will be called *Circuit and Sessions Judge*.

---

[1] *Ibid*, 1881-82, p. 19.

[2] *Ibid*, 1882-83, p. 13.

[3] Extract from a speech by the late Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Selborne. H. J. S. Cotton's "New India," p. 73.

[4] *Black and White*, October 13, 1894, p. 470.

---

[1] Calcutta High Court's Civil Report for 1881, p. 32.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1882, p. 39.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1883, p. 26.

[4] *Ibid.*, 1884, p. 31.

[5] *Ibid.*, 1892, p. 29.

The place of the *present* District Judge should be taken by a Subordinate Judge in each district, and he should be called the District Judge. As there are at present fifty-three Subordinate Judges and only twenty-eight District Judgeships in the regulation districts of Bengal there will still remain some Subordinate Judges who will continue to be called Subordinate Judges, and appeals from their decisions will lie to the Circuit Judges, the appeals from the *new* District Judges lying to the High Court as at present.

It might be urged against this scheme that it does not provide for a Sessions Judge for each district. But even now there are several districts which have no separate judges. There is one judge for Hugli and Howra, one for Pubna and Bogra, one for Rajshahi and Maldah, one for Bhagalpur and Moughyr, one for Jessor and Khulna, one for Cuttack, Puri and Balasore, one for Rangpur and Jalpaiguri, and one for Dinajpur and Darjiling. The carrying out of the above scheme will, therefore, not be an *innovation* in, but an *extension* of, the present system.

The next point for consideration is, what increase in the number of Subordinate Judges will be necessary to meet the increased work thrown on them? It appears from the Annual Statement I, appended to the High Court's Civil Report for 1892, that, while trying as many "appeals" and "miscellaneous" cases as the District Judge, each Subordinate Judge tried on an average 606 original suits, against twenty-seven tried by a District Judge. It is needless to say that the trial of "original" suits takes up very much longer time than the trial of "appeals" and "miscellaneous" cases.

It appears from the Bengal Quarterly Civil List for April, 1894, that six District Judgeships, have been reserved for the Subordinate Judges. It will be sufficient if the strength of the *new* District Judges is increased by this number.

Now let us see what will be the financial result of the proposed scheme. There are, for the regulation districts, at present fifteen District Judges on Rs. 2,500, and fifteen on Rs. 2,000. In place of these there will be sixteen Circuit Judges, eight on Rs. 2,500, and eight on Rs. 2,000. The saving will accordingly be Rs. 2,500 × 7 + Rs. 2,000 × 7 = Rs. 31,500 a month.

Against the above saving is to be put down the increased expenditure for constituting the posts of the *new* District Judges. There are at present seven Subordinate Judges on Rs. 1,000, sixteen on Rs. 800, and thirty on Rs. 600. To this is to be added the six *new* judgeships referred to above. There will be thus two on Rs. 1,600, four on Rs. 1,200, seven on Rs. 1,000, sixteen on Rs. 800, and thirty on Rs. 600. As there are at present twenty-eight districts having judges of their own, it will be possible to provide each of these districts with a judge under the proposed scheme without coming down to the third grade of Subordinate Judges on Rs. 600 a month, who will continue Subordinate Judges as at present. The only additional expenditure will be on account of the six judgeships referred to above. The expenditure on account of these new appointments will be Rs. 1,600 × 2 + Rs. 1,200 × 4 = Rs. 8,000 a month. Subtracting this amount from the saving to be effected by the reduction in the *present District Judgeships* there will remain a net saving of Rs. 23,500 a month.

The evils of the present system, under which the magistrate of the district combines in himself the functions of a police, revenue, and criminal officer, have passed the stage of discussion. They are admitted by Government, and the only point left for discussion is as to how they can be remedied. A scheme was proposed by Mr. R. C. Dutt, now Commissioner of Burdwan, in INDIA for August, 1893, the outlines of which are:—

> "The District Magistrate (to be hereafter called District Officer) should be employed purely on executive and revenue work, and should be relieved of his judicial duties, which should be transferred to the District Judge. The subordinates of the District Officer, who will continue to perform revenue and executive work only, will remain under him: while those of his present subordinates who will be employed on purely judicial work should be subordinate to the Judge and not to the District Officer."

It seems to me that Mr. Dutt's scheme is liable to the very grave objection that it does away altogether with the office of the District Magistrate. The functions of a judge and a magistrate are different, and there are many duties which, under the laws now in force, a District Magistrate only can perform. Besides, there should be in each district a Chief Magistrate to supervise the proceedings of the many subordinate courts, some of which are presided over by Honorary Magistrates who are not very well acquainted with criminal laws. To expect that this work of supervision should be done by the judge in addition to his present duties is to expect too much. At the commencement of the British rule the offices of collector and magistrate were separate. They were united in 1831, and separated again in 1837. But

> "in consequence of the small salaries (Rs. 900 per mensem) allowed to the magistrates the office fell into the hands of the junior and more inexperienced members of the service, and the effect upon the administration of justice was what might naturally have been expected."[1]

The two offices were accordingly united again in 1859. The time has now come when they should again be separated. There should be a magistrate for each district, who should have nothing whatever to do in the shape of police, revenue, or other executive duties, which should be left in the hands of the collectors to be hereafter called the District Officer, as suggested by Mr. R. C. Dutt in the scheme already referred to. I am not unprepared for the objection that will be raised to giving a separate magistrate for each district on the ground of increased demand on the finances of India, drained dry as they at present are by civil, military, and home charges. Though expense should not be of any consideration in a matter like this, which is of vital importance for the good administration of the country, I shall try to work out my scheme without requiring any considerable new outlay on the part of Government.

Before discussing the question of expense let us see from what class of persons the judges and magistrates should be appointed. That the civilians make bad judges and magistrates will have appeared from the opinion of Sir Charles Paul already quoted.

---

[1] C. D. Field's "Introduction to the Regulations," p. 155.

This is the universally prevalent opinion in India and by the attempt that Government once made to train a better class of judges it gave expression of views to the same effect. None but interested parties will dispute that barristers and pleaders will make better judges and magistrates than the members of the Civil Service who should be relieved of all judicial duties, Civil and Criminal. Barristers and pleaders of some years' standing and practice should be appointed magistrates and the promotion to Circuit and Sessions Judgeships should be made from amongst the magistrates. As a corollary of this the High Court Judgeships and the Legal Remembrancership now held by civilians should be given to the best amongst the circuit judges.

The chief magistrate of the Calcutta Police Court, a barrister, draws a salary of Rs. 1,500 a month, without any prospects of promotion. He only gets an additional allowance of Rs. 300 if he is also a coroner. But the two offices are not always held by the same person. The second judge of the Calcutta Small Cause Court, a barrister, gets only Rs. 1,400, the third and fourth judges, barristers, get even less. Only the chief judge gets Rs. 2,000 rising to Rs. 2,500 after many years' service, without the prospect of ever rising to a High Court judgeship. If therefore, the initial pay of a District magistrate is fixed at Rs. 1,500 and there is a higher grade on Rs. 1,800 the new magistrates will be placed on exactly the same footing as the present Magistrate-Collectors, who relieved of their magisterial duties will, hereafter, be called District officers. As the new magistrates will have prospects of rising to Circuit judgeships before long and ultimately to High Court judgeships there will be no difficulty in getting able and efficient barristers and pleaders for the posts of magistrates.

Let us now see what the carrying out of the above scheme will cost. There are 36 districts in the Regulation Provinces of Bengal. If there are 16 magistrates on Rs. 1,800 and 20 on Rs. 1,500, the total monthly expenditure for the new magistrates will be Rs. 1,800 × 16 + Rs. 1,500 × 20 = Rs. 58,800.

The withdrawal of all judicial posts from the Civil Service will be accompanied by a corresponding reduction in the number of "joints" and "assistants" at present retained for filling up District Judgeships. Roughly speaking, the ratio of these higher appointments in the Judicial Branch of the Civil Service to those in the Executive is as 2 : 3, or, in other words, two-fifths of the junior members of the Civil Service are retained for filling up judicial appointments in the higher grades. On the 1st April, 1894, there were 22 "joints" on Rs. 900, 12 "joints" on Rs. 700, 40 assistants on Rs. 500, 7 assistants on Rs. 450, and 15 assistants on Rs. 400. The saving effected by reducing these numbers to the extent of two-fifths will be as follows:

Salaries of	Rs.	Rs.
9 Joint Magistrates @ ..	900 =	8,100
5 ,, ,, @ ..	700 =	3,500
16 Assistant ,, @ ..	500 =	8,000
2 ,, ,, @ ..	450 =	900
6 ,, ,, @ ..	400 =	2,400
Total saving (monthly) =		Rs. 22,900

It will not be necessary to increase the number of Deputy Magistrates to do the work hitherto done by the above "joints" and "assistants," as the *new* District Magistrates will, unlike the present magistrates, try cases themselves.

It has already been shown that the abolition of the *present* District Civilian Judges and the creation of sixteen Circuit and Sessions Judges in their place will result in a saving of Rs. 23,500 a month. This amount added to the above will give Rs. 46,400 a month available for the new District Magistrates. There will still remain Rs. 12,400 to be provided for in carrying out my scheme. More than half of this amount will be met by savings effected by reducing the Ministerial establishments of the present District Judges, as the *new* District Judges, except six, will not require *new* establishments. All that they will require will be slight additions to their present establishments as Subordinate Judges. The posts of "translators" at present retained for the Civilian Judges will no longer be required, for the *new* District Judges, being acquainted with the Vernaculars of the country, will not require the proceedings of the lower (Munsiff's) court to be translated into English in "appeal" cases. A few translators might be required for the Circuit Judges, but as the number of appeals triable by them will be very small, it will suffice if the posts of head clerk and translator are combined in their cases. Reductions will also be effected in the Ministerial establishments of those "joints" and "assistants," whose posts will be abolished. No new establishments will be required for the *new* District Magistrates, as there exist already two separate establishments for the present Magistrate-Collector. It is, however, unnecessary to enter further into the details of reductions to be effected in the Ministerial establishments, as the additional amount required at the hands of Government will not be at all large. It appears from the Calcutta High Court's Civil Report for 1892 that in 1885 the Government had a net profit of Rs. 14,75,000 from its law courts in Bengal. The "surplus must now be very much greater, as the number of institutions has since then largely increased."

The result of the carrying out of my scheme will be that not only will the country have better judges and magistrates than at present, but also the separation of the judicial and executive functions now exercised by magistrate-collectors will be entire and thorough. The mere withdrawal of police control from the hands of the present magistrate-collectors will not be sufficient to prevent mischief, as often the interests of Government on the revenue side clash with those of the people, and the collector, if so disposed, can use his magisterial powers against the latter. A most flagrant instance of this abuse of power was furnished recently by a magistrate-collector who in a dispute between Government and a zemindar about a piece of water, failing to get the zemindar's men convicted under one section of the penal code by one subordinate magistrate, had them re-tried under a different section by another subordinate magistrate, appeal from whose sentence lay to him, the magistrate-collector. Besides, it will not satisfy the *amour propre* of the Civil Service if the superintendents of police are independent of it. An objection has been taken in certain quarters to the scheme of police reform set forth in the November number of INDIA, on the ground that it did not provide for the withdrawal of police control from the hands of the District Magistrate. The whole question of the separation of the judicial and executive functions vested in magistrate-collectors, which is now discussed, was too complicated a one to be dealt with in that article. What was omitted therein is now supplied.

It is hardly necessary to say that all the Subordinate Magistrates will, under my scheme, be under the District Magistrates, who in their turn will be under the Circuit and Sessions Judges, and they under the High Court, and not directly under the Lieutenant-Governor or Governor. I say Governor, as my scheme applies equally to all the regulation Provinces of Bengal, N.-W. Provinces, Bombay, and Madras. If the principle of separation is once accepted and introduced in the Regulation Provinces it might easily be extended to the non-Regulation Provinces.

It might be urged that the effect of carrying out the above scheme will be that an inferior class of European barristers and a disproportionately large number of Indian barristers and pleaders will enter the judicial service. The latter consequence could easily be averted by limiting the number of Indian magistrates. As regards the former there will be no difficulty in getting from amongst English barristers as well educated and as intelligent men as are to be found in the ranks of the Civil Service. Englishmen do not as a rule begin the study of law until they have gone through a certain course of university studies. Even now there are many graduates of Cambridge and Oxford practising as barristers in the various High Courts and Chief Courts in India, and with new prospects of judicial appointments a greater number of able barristers will be attracted to the Indian courts from England. By making it a rule that none but those barristers who possess University degrees and have practised in India for a certain number of years, will be eligible for appointment as District Magistrates, it will be possible to guard against favouritism and nepotism on the part of the judges of the High Courts with whom, as a body, the nominations will rest. Judges and magistrates are not appointed in England on the results of competitive examinations and they should not be so appointed in India. Englishmen occupying the honourable position of judges of High Courts in India are as honest, high-minded, and impartial as their compatriots in England.

My scheme will not find favour with the civilian rulers of India who would administer justice, not according to law, but according *to their own individual ideas of right and wrong* . I appeal not to them but to the generous and liberal-minded British public and to the members of the Imperial Parliament with whom the destinies of India finally rest. Let them look calmly and without a bias at the present state of things. Let them carefully examine the scheme herein set forth before they throw it away as imperfect or impracticable. It does not propose to give to Indians more pay as District Judges than they at present receive as Subordinate Judges. It does not to any material extent increase their civil powers. It simply changes their name from Subordinate Judges to District Judges in the case of some. As the *new* District Judges will still be subordinate to the Circuit Judges who, as a rule, will be Europeans, the *prestige* of the British rule will not in any way be affected by the change. The most experienced amongst the Subordinate Judges will take the place of the present inexperienced civilian judges who are lamentably ignorant of the civil laws of the country. As regards the *new* District Magistrates none of them, if the Government objects, need be Indians, though even now they are eligible for Magistrate-Collectorships.

The present system, under which the Civilian Magistrate-Collectors having control of the police and looking after the revenue and other interests of Government prosecute criminals and try them or watch their trial by courts subordinate to them, is too vicious to last much longer in these advanced days with a Government like that of England based on broad principles of law and justice.

PARBATI C. ROY.

THE PERMANENT SETTLEMENT: ITS SUGGESTED EXTENSION.

BY F. PINCOTT.

THE strongest and ablest argument which has yet been framed for the extension of the Permanent Settlement to Oudh, has just been published at Lucknow, by Seth Raghuber Dayal, Taluqdar of Moizuddinpur. He is an honorary magistrate and a firm supporter of English authority, and he puts forth his views with the temperance of a man addressing those he esteems as worthy and honourable men. He presses his conclusions with earnestness in the interests of both the Indian Government and the people, because he believes that honest men will welcome the truth. No one can come to a knowledge of the practical working of the land-revenue system of India without becoming convinced that it is the primary cause of the poverty, debt, and semi-starvation which afflict the people of that country. To ascribe the prevailing debt and difficulty to the occasional marriage feasts which take place, as is generally done, is only to illustrate the parable of the man with the beam in his own eye criticising the mote in his brother's eye. Marriage feasts, and idle and dissipated people, existed in India in all ages, but they never brought on universal beggary until the last sixty or seventy years. It is only in the present century, under what is called enlightened sway, that wealth and comfort have disappeared and that the land has passed into the hand of the money-lender. Those who conceived, and those who administer the system are probably unaware of the mischief which it is working in the country; and those who may not realise its perniciousness will do well to read the document which Mr. Dayal has placed at their service.

The assessment of the land is based on theoretical justice, but it is wrong in principle, and the amount levied has been fixed at too high a rate; and it is, furthermore, exacted with methodical rigour, and systematically pushed upwards and upwards in amount at recurrent periods. The old Hindu sovereigns took one-sixth of the produce; the Mussulman rulers took one quarter; and the English take one half of the gross rental. The valuation is, however, made by those who exact the contribution, none of whom are practical agriculturists, and all of whom arrive at their conclusions by mechanical processes, and have no interest in the result beyond that of raising the assessment to the highest justifiable amount. Under such circumstances the interests of the payer are not likely to receive satisfactory consideration even from the most conscientious of assessors.

The older rulers, both Hindu and Muhammadan, took the revenue in kind, and their exact proportions could be accurately ascertained. The English insist on taking money which is fixed in amount for a definite number of years until raised at the next re-assessment. It is true that under the older system the measurement was rough, and the myrmidons of the rulers took a very large sixth for the royal share. But it was after all only a proportional share of actual produce, and left the major portion of the crop to the agriculturist. The proportion which a fixed sum of money, however, bears to the value of the crop necessarily varies every year. For whereas drought, wind, flood, blight, and the other plagues of agriculture continually enhance the proportional incidence of the tax, no abatement or variation of the tax itself is permitted. Theoretically the tax is fixed on the basis of average crops, but practically the amount is so high that only average good crops can afford to pay it. The Oudh Taluqdar tells us: "Statistics show that so little is left to them of the produce in normal years, that one bad harvest involves them in utter ruin." Furthermore, as the Government exacts a money payment, the landholder is compelled to do the same. The consequence is that all the vicissitudes of fickle agriculture are thrust upon the unhappy tenant, who has to pay every year a *fixed* money payment equal to the *estimated* value of half his *estimated* average crop. If the money payment were proportional to the quantity or value of the actual crop the injustice would not be so great, but the imaginary crop is only estimated by the party whose interest it is to exaggerate it, and then a tax is fixed for twenty years or so as though this estimate were solid fact. Practically three-quarters and even more of the actual crop has to be sold in order to pay the half which is shared between the Government and the landholder. The last quarter of the crop is all that the most hopeful farmer can look forward to for his maintenance and for meeting all his liabilities. The inelasticity of the English system adds greatly to the misery of the agriculturist. For the revenue tax has to be paid to the day, regardless of the season or the state of the crop, and no official has power to remit revenue or defer payment. He can recommend remission, and is frequently compelled to do so. But before such a recommendation is made, burdensome debt has been incurred, and enervating misery has been endured. It is, indeed, the palpable evidence that no more can be got from the peasantry which drives the official to counsel forbearance.

But even now the paralysing effect of the system is but half told, for the landlord is in as bad a plight as the tenant. The Government takes from him half the gross rental, and exacts it from him by the most summary of all processes—the immediate seizure and sale of his estates—but it leaves him to meet all the village expenses, the maintenance of police and registry officers, the local rates, local cesses, and the various special contributions and subscriptions with which he has been saddled. These payments, which are compulsory, diminish the landlord's share by one-half, and out of even this poor remnant he has yet to meet the losses of rental caused by failure of crops, by flood and drought, which compel him to make immediate concessions to his farmers. The Government has decreed that it is criminal for the landlord to employ the stick and the slipper in the collection of his rent, but while endowing itself with summary jurisdiction for the recovery of its own share, it leaves the landlord to the slow and costly processes of law to get what he can of his dues from the impoverished tenants.

In addition to all this comes the periodical re-assessment of the land. As though intended to kill all hope in the hearts of the people, the profit on every improvement, or fancied improvement, is systematically taken from both landlord and tenant by constantly enhanced assessments. Every re-assessment sends the tax higher, never lower. For although both landlord and tenant have been for long years steadily sinking deeper and deeper into debt and misery, the value of the land is supposed to be always increasing, and is deemed to be capable of bearing higher and higher charges. There is no part of India where temporary settlement prevails in which this is not the case. There is no part of India in which the poverty of the people is not a graver reflection on the Government than any words which a writer may pen. The exaction of a high rate of money-payment has impoverished the country, and the periodical re-assessments have taken away the incentive to improvement. It is scarcely possible to conceive a worse system than this, or one more certain to bring a people to wretchedness; and when administered with the steady pertinacity and sleepless vigilance of English legal methods, there can be no system more crushing in its oppressiveness.

In circumstances such as these a landlord of Oudh has felt himself driven to risk the consequences of earnestly pressing upon the Indian Government the desirability of conferring the same relief upon Oudh which has proved efficacious in the province of Bengal. Under the Permanent Settlement Bengal has become fairly wealthy and enlightened, and a moderate amount of rational conciliation would make that province the stronghold of British dominion. The hopeless poverty which has settled down over the rest of India has given birth to widespread discontent, which may at any time pass into despair and become dangerous. This is particularly dangerous in Oudh, where, since the rebellion of 1857, the men who used to fill the Indian army have been thrown upon the land to seethe under a sense of wrong aggravated by the difficulties of their position. The evil consequences of the enhanced settlement of 1861 are thus described in the Oudh Revenue Report of 1872:—

> "As regards the collection of the land revenue, we shall soon have a new set of landlords. . . . . The total of both sales and mortgages amounts to a third of the revenue of the district. It would be difficult to meet with a single village, except the larger taluqas, in which the owners are free from debt, and the land free from incumbrance. I can affirm with confidence that the money, save a fraction or so, borrowed during the year, was taken to pay revenue, and to no other purpose. The zemindars have been, and are, unable to meet the enhanced assessment."

This official statement openly ascribes the debts incurred to the pressure of revenue charges, not to marriage-feasts and other trivialities, and admits the injurious result of enhancing assessments. The evils of the mere process of periodical re-assessment were thus described by Sir Auckland Colvin in an official Memorandum:—

> "In 1874, twenty-six years will have elapsed from the date on which the two first of the districts now comprised in the North-West Provinces were placed in the hands of a Settlement Officer. Others were begun twelve years ago, and are not yet sanctioned; one of these is not yet even completed. These facts are significant to those who know what the settlement of a district means—the value of property depreciated until the exact amount of the new assessment is declared, credit affected, heart-burning and irritation between landlord and tenant, suspicion of the intentions of the Government, a host of official underlings scattered broadcast over the vexed villages. Nothing can equal the injury inflicted by a slow, uncertain settlement, dragging its length along, obstructed by conflicting orders and harrassed by successive administrations, and finally threatened with annihilation at the moment when it seems to have nearly finished its course. . . . . Little wonder that we hear of the land wanting rest!"

English administration takes credit for having brought internal wars to an end in India, but it should be remembered that these wars afflicted chiefly main lines of communication, the more secluded districts remaining unaffected for long periods of time. But here we find every district and field of a province subjected for years to all the losses of military occupation. No band of armed oppressors could cause more injury to the prosperity of a country than is recorded in this official description of a settlement (!) operation. War is a torrent of crime and iniquity, but it passes on, and may not recur in the same spot for a lifetime, and opportunity for recovery is thus afforded. The devastation caused by protracted settlements strangles hope by its lengthened misery, and is no sooner brought to a temporary end than the dreary process is ready to begin again. It seems difficult to devise a system more certain to produce widespread poverty and render the industrial improvement of the country impossible. On the reason for non-improvement the Taluqdar of Oudh, who has brought the matter forward, says:—

> "Now the Taluqdars' reply to the charge of being unimproving landlords is this: Poverty and improvement do not go hand in hand. When the revenue demands are so exacting that in order to meet them the Taluqdar has to incur heavy debts, his estate must, sooner or later, pass into the hands of his creditors; and that, even if he be an improving landlord, under the present revenue system he can hardly hope to reap the full benefit of his capital and industry when he has to undergo from time to time the trials of periodical settlements. Adopt measures which would secure to each man the fruits of his industry, and the most indifferent landlord would be prompted to improve his property. What the landlords want is permanent settlement of land revenue; and this demand, I submit, is based upon justice and the best principles of political economy. It is based upon justice because they see that their brethren in Bengal have got this boon and have prospered under it, while they, in spite of the unswerving loyalty with which they have accepted the measures of the Government, are subjected to periodic settlements, which are a source of constant dread and anxiety to them. They feel that after the assistance they have rendered to the Government in its land legislation, one of the principal objects of which was the placing of the Government revenue upon a more definite and securer footing, they too may ask their rulers to place their resources upon a permanent basis, by granting them the boon of Permanent Settlement. Their demand is also based upon the soundest principles of political economy, because one of the chief incentives to the accumulation of wealth is the sense of security as regards its enjoyment, and that no man can be expected to expend his capital and energy upon enterprises the fruits of which he can never be sure of reaping. Human nature makes no distinction between land and any other kind of property in this respect. But we know how absurd the suggestion would be that the duties upon manufactured goods should vary with the rise and fall of their profits, and should be revised periodically with this object. Exactly the same principle applies to land, and to impose additional taxation upon it in proportion to its improvement in the hands of an industrious landlord is nothing more nor less than a penalty upon improvement."

There is but one stereotyped answer to those who advocate the permanent settlement of land in India, and that is the assertion that the land-tax is the main source of revenue, and that a permanent settlement would debar the Government from the means of providing for the needs of an increasing and progressive civilisation. This assertion expresses the small-minded view of bureaucracy, not the views of real statesmanship. The needed increase of revenue can only be safely and adequately secured by the advancing prosperity of a whole country. Anything therefore which impoverishes a country and prevents enterprise must lead to stagnation of revenue. The inelasticity of revenue, which every Indian Finance Minister has deplored for many years past, is itself an open condemnation of the system on which revenue is now being raised. A country with the vast material resources of India ought to possess indefinitely expanding sources of revenue, and would possess them if properly administered. The fault is in the managers of the estate, not in the estate itself. The mineral wealth of India lies dormant, and trade and manufactures are practically non-existent as far as the people of the country themselves are concerned, and the reason for this absence of enterprise is the fact that agriculture, the only industry which has survived the European irruption, is not allowed to accumulate sufficient capital because of taxation and a general sense of insecurity. The yearly revenue tax presses so severely on the agriculturist that he dare not change the nature of his crops or venture on experiments, although satisfied in his mind that advantage would result from doing so. He has no margin for experiments and improvements. Week in week out his ceaseless struggle is to scrape together enough to pay the tax and live. Thus not only the landlord and the farmer, but enterprise, trade, manufacture, and the general prosperity of the country are all, like the Laocoon family, strangled to death by the ever tightening coils of the land-revenue hydra.

It is nothing less than a confession of failure for the administrators of such a country as India to declare that the revenue cannot be increased without danger. The imposition of import duties on European manufactured goods was a candid admission that the land-tax had been pushed to its highest justifiable point, but the refusal of the Home Government to allow Manchester goods to be taxed has forced the Indian authorities to give another turn to the screw, and something like consternation fell upon the people who were being subjected to re-assessment. There seems to be good cause for this consternation, for notwithstanding the bankrupt condition of the people, Mr. Reid's "Note on the Proposed Assessment," dated 11 July, 1893, states that the assessment of the Jarhan Tract has been raised from Rs. 50,588 to Rs. 80,264, and that of the Dumatt Tract, from Rs. 1,34,377 to Rs. 2,05,593, being increases of 62 and 66 per cent. respectively. In the district of Partabgarh the land revenue has everywhere been raised above half the gross rental; rent-free lands and grants have been assessed: inundated tracts, which are only occasionally useful, have been assessed as ordinary lands; groves of trees have been treated as cultivated fields if a peasant has grown a little fodder for cattle in one part of them; lands have been rated as irrigated although the tanks have long since dried up; and a general enhancement of 40 per cent. has been made. Into such acts of oppression as these is the Indian Government being driven. Only a few months ago something like rebellion broke out in Assam caused by an unjustifiable enhancement of land-tax, and after a painful loss of life the Indian Government deemed it prudent to reduce the exaction. Quite recently thousands of people abandoned their fields in the south of the Punjab, and marched to Lahore demanding to be saved from proposed enhancements of rent, amounting to 100, 200, and even 300 per cent.

Seth Raghuber Dayal has done a service to Government by explaining the injurious operation of the present system of assessing and re-assessing the land, and as it cannot be supposed that the Government of India desires to force on universal bankruptcy, it is to be expected that the extension of the blessings of the Permanent Settlement to other parts of India than Bengal will be seriously taken in hand. It is time that some statesmanship was devoted to the revenue system, and that the barbarous method of simply raising the land-tax whenever money is wanted was done away with for ever. It is a process which has been admittedly pushed to an extreme, and in the course of it beggary and bankruptcy have been reached before the development of the country has even commenced. The money raised has been spent on salaries, wars, troops, armaments, military communications, and efforts to keep down the people, and now we seem to have exhausted nearly all that was to have been preserved in the effort to preserve it. There still, however, remain the vast untouched mineral resources of the country, and the manufactures and trade of which India is the natural home. Stern necessity must soon compel the authorities to allow the Indian agriculturist the means of accumulating capital, in order that other branches of trade may be financed. When 90 per cent. of a people are agriculturists, and they are nearly all reduced to debt and beggary by injudicious taxation, progress is impossible. There is only one method of escape from this Slough of Despond, and that is by giving to the people the only incentive to progress which operates on human nature, that is, the possibility of enjoying the fruits of improvements.

The "Thoughts on the Oudh Settlement Question," which have given rise to these comments, should be read and pondered. They abound in practical good sense, which appeals to the experience of every human being, and they are supported by the cited opinions and statements of many Indian officials of eminence.

Frederic Pincott.

THE TENTH CONGRESS.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS BY MR. ALFRED WEBB, M.P.

We take the following passages from the Presidential Address delivered by Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., at the Tenth Indian National Congress, held at Madras, on December 26th, 1894:

OBJECTS OF THE CONGRESS.

The objects of these Congresses cannot be better stated than in the words of your first President: "The promotion of personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the more earnest workers in your country's cause in all parts of the Empire; the eradication by direct friendly intercourse of all possible race, creed, or national prejudices amongst all lovers of your country; and the fuller development and consolidation of those sentiments of national unity that had their origin in Lord Ripon's ever memorable reign; the authoritative record, after this has been carefully elicited by the fullest discussion, of the matured opinions of the educated classes in India on some of the more important and pressing of the social questions of the day; the determination of the lines upon, and the methods by which, during the next twelve months, it is desirable for native politicians to labour in the public interests."

The ends you have in view are similar to those of politicians in other quarters of the globe. The difficulties before you are however greater. Elsewhere politicians have to deal principally with homogeneous populations, to whom, at least in theory, equal political rights may at once be accorded; you have largely to work for those who yet have to pass through a long process of assimilation and elevation. All the greater necessity that in assemblages such as this you should set yourselves to the task. All the greater necessity that a deaf ear should be turned to doctrines of despair. The question is not regarding the difficulties, but as to whether or not the difficulties are to be faced; and if to be faced, the sooner the better. And it is alone by and through organisations such as yours that they can be faced.

THE PRESIDENTS OF THE CONGRESS.

Your presidents hitherto have been distinguished men, mainly as was right, from amongst your own people, and representing, as they should, some of the principal races and religions of India. Most eminent amongst these presidents was Dadabhai Naoroji, not only because of his great abilities and his life-long services to his country, but because of the position he occupies as your only native representative in the Imperial Parliament. The electors of Finsbury have done themselves honour in returning him. As to your other native presidents, the ability of their addresses and the manner in which they conducted your proceedings showed their fitness for the trusts confided to them. The lamented George Yule of Calcutta, almost one of yourselves, presided at your fourth Congress. Sir William Wedderburn conducted the fifth. I have styled Mr. Naoroji your only *native* representative in the Imperial Parliament. In Sir William Wedderburn you have another representative equally zealous and devoted—one of the faithful few whose clear conceptions of equality and justice have been unobscured by long official service. There is another name which, although not on the list of your presidents, cannot be omitted in recalling, however slightly, your past proceedings—that of Charles Bradlaugh, "the friend and champion of India." He attended and addressed your fifth Congress. The report of the sixth is formally dedicated to his memory. You never lost a better or an abler friend. Few men were ever so sincerely mourned by a larger proportion of the human race. Having already placed in the chair two Scotchmen, you have now chosen an Irishman. Doubtless, after a becoming interval with native presidents, you will call an Englishman. My nationality is the principal ground for my having been selected. I have none of the brilliant qualifications of my predecessors. On your kind invitation I take the position that was intended for a great fellow-countryman of my own. However I do not question the fitness of your choice, for I am representative in several respects. I was nurtured in the conflict against American slavery. In the words of William Lloyd Garrison, the founder of that movement, "My country is the world; my countrymen are all mankind." To aid in the elevation of my native land has been the endeavour of my riper years. In the words of Daniel O'Connell, "My sympathies are not confined to my own green island. I am a friend to civil and religious liberty all over the world." I hate tyranny and oppression wherever practised, more especially if practised by my own government, for then I am in a measure responsible. I have felt the bitterness of subjection in my own country. I am a member of the Irish Parliamentary Party. I am one of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. I am a Dissenter, proud of the struggles of my Quaker forefathers for freedom of thought and action: a Protestant returned by a Catholic constituency—a Protestant living in a Catholic country, testifying against craven fears of a return to obsolete religious bitterness and intolerance—fears in your country and in mine worked upon to impede the progress of liberty. To be placed in this chair is the highest honour to which I can ever aspire. . .

INDIA AND THE IRISH QUESTION.

While most anxious not to implicate your cause with Irish politics, or the relations between Great Britain and Ireland, I may occasionally illustrate your affairs by reference to my own country. Your interests are in fact closely involved in some effectual settlement of the Irish question. One of your principal and most just complaints is that no sufficient attention is given to your affairs in Parliament. Whilst months are allotted to the consideration of the British budget, a few hours are grudged to yours. Parliament is paralysed with work. It has undertaken functions it cannot perform. Three separate Parliaments had enough to do to manage the affairs of England, Scotland, and Ireland. They were merged into one when the population of the United Kingdom was only fifteen millions. That population has now risen to thirty-eight millions. Parliament has, moreover, undertaken to care for your two hundred and eighty millions. The sphere of law is becoming both wider and more minute. Surely Parliament ought to be more of an Imperial, less of a local, assembly. For generations to come, England, the heart of the Empire, must have the preponderating influence in Imperial councils. That we grant. You, who are Indian, and I, who am Irish, trust that our Imperial rights will not suffer from that preponderating English influence. But at present the Imperial Parliament is occupied largely with the affairs of under five millions of people, and ministries rise and fall on the question of Ireland rather than great Imperial interests. The entire Empire is concerned in the speedy settlement of the Irish question.

THE ARMS ACT.

In Ireland during most of my lifetime it has been a penal offence to carry arms without licence, and licences are strictly guarded. In India you rest under closer restrictions. Some modification of the rules under the Arms Act is necessary, "so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to, India without distinction of creed, caste, or colour; to ensure the liberal concession of licences wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle, or crops; and to make all licences granted under the revised rules of life-long tenure revocable only on proof of misuse and valid throughout the provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued." With us the prohibitions are an insult to the soil; with you to the race.

THE POVERTY OF INDIA.

Nothing is more striking in considering the condition of India than its poverty compared with the wealth of the rest of the Western world, especially with the United Kingdom. (The riches of Great Britain are so enormous that the poverty of Ireland scarcely affects the general average.) The mean annual income of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom has been estimated at £33 14s.; that of the people of India at from Rs. 20 to Rs. 27. Mr. Fowler, in his ministerial statement this year, dwelt upon the comparative lightness of the burthen of Indian taxation compared with that in the United Kingdom, forgetting that five per cent. on an income of Rs. 20 is a much heavier burthen than 7½ per cent. on £33. It is impossible, upon any basis of fair play, to justify debiting you with so many large items, such as the India Office and India Office expenses, recruiting depôts, loss on exchange, and the like, which really form a portion of the British home charges. If the maintenance of the Indian Empire is so essential to British prestige and greatness, if the honour and glory are to be Britain's, surely she, not you, should bear the heavy burthens. She does not attempt to collect similar charges from the Colonies.

The aggregate *annual savings* of the United Kingdom in the years between 1840 and 1888 have been estimated at £110,000,000, or over £300,000 a day. Such accumulations of wealth, combined with parsimonious dealings with poorer peoples, are irreconcilable with real belief in the precepts of righteousness.

The expenditure upon the Army in India, which in 1882-83 stood at Rx. 18,359,000 (including Rx. 17,000 for Afghanistan and Rx. 1,308,000 for Egypt), had in 1893 risen by 27 per cent. to Rx. 23,877,000. Any advantages to be derived from this increased expenditure have not been shared in alike by native and by British troops. The pensions of European officers have been raised 37 per cent., of native officers only 11 per cent. Thirteen per cent. more per man is spent upon the British rank and file; four per cent. less per man upon the native rank and file.

Your taxes spent abroad have risen from Rx. 17,369,000 in 1882 by 31 per cent. to Rx. 22,911,000 in 1892. In the former year they amounted to 23 per cent., in the latter to 25 per cent. of your total expenditure. No country could permanently afford such a drain. These increases are not materially due to alterations in the rate of exchange.

THE CONDITION OF AGRICULTURE.

These startling facts demand grave consideration east and west of Suez, apart from the daily deteriorating condition of agriculture generally. I am not competent enough to speak on the state of your peasantry, but so far as all accounts go, official included, there are strong grounds to apprehend danger from the agricultural condition of the country. I am aware that this problem constantly engages the attention of the supreme Government, and it is to be hoped that it will take a new departure in its policy of land revenue. Mere palliatives will never do. A judicious and statesmanlike survey of the existing situation should enable it to devise a satisfactory remedy. Whatever action may be taken to free the impoverished peasantry from the hands of the money-lenders will go a great way to ameliorate their condition. And Government itself should modify its cast-iron system of exacting revenue at dates at which the cultivators are least prepared to discharge the State dues. We must, however, not take a gloomy view of the situation. If you have greater difficulties to contend with than we in Ireland, you will remember that your population has been increasing, whilst ours has been reduced by over 40 per cent. within the past half century. Whilst you have lee-way to make up in education and material advancement, your relative progress has been, and is, out of all proportion to ours.

THE INDIAN COUNCILS ACT.

The justice of, and necessity for, adequate representation in your superior and local councils is apparent, and naturally claims much of your attention. The administrative mutilation of the manifest intentions of Parliament in framing the Indian Councils Act is much to be deplored. I see that complaints have been made in every province where the enlarged councils are established, that the distribution of seats for representation of the people is most unsatisfactory; and that, while some interests are over-represented, other important interests are not represented at all. This is not in accordance with the expressed views of British statesmen on both sides of the House when the Bill was discussed. Mr. Gladstone said: "I believe I am justified in looking forward, not merely to a nominal, but to a real living representation of the people of India." Lord Salisbury was no less emphatic: "If we are to do it, and if it has to be done, let us do it systematically . . . . taking care that the machinery to be provided shall effect the purpose of giving representation, not to accidentally constituted bodies, not to small sections of the people here and there, but to the living strength and vital forces of the whole community of India." How little have these anticipations been realised. We have here a striking instance of the extent to which administration can defeat the intentions of legislation.

JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

It is, indeed, almost more necessary for the contentment of a people that they should have the administration than the enactment of the laws. It is, moreover, desirable that judicial should, as far as possible, be separated from executive functions, that civil and military employments in medical and other departments should not be held by the same persons. The average military officer, supreme in his own sphere, is, of all others, least suited by his training to administer civil affairs in a sympathetic and conciliatory spirit. It has been well said that "The frame of mind necessary for an executive officer, and the frame of mind necessary for a judge are different. Executive officers ought to mix freely with the people, they ought to try to make friends with them, they ought to see this, and they ought to see that; a judge, on the contrary, ought to shut his ears against everything except that which comes before him in court. But an executive officer has, as such, to learn everything and to do everything, and when he comes upon the bench, he is expected to divest his mind of whatever he has heard elsewhere. Even the best officer of Government is after all a human being."

TRIAL BY JURY.

You have properly protested against the curtailment of your rights regarding trial by jury. Whether we compare the number of convictions before and since the institution of the system thirty years ago, or the state of affairs in districts where it was not established with that where it was established, there appears nothing to justify recent changes. Officials sometimes forget that the general attitude of the people towards the law is of more consequence than the number of malefactors sentenced. It is an old principle of English jurisprudence that it is better that many guilty should escape than that one innocent man should suffer. Love of law, the conception that it is for the good of all—so deeply implanted in the hearts of sovereign peoples, who have been able to mould it to their will—is naturally a plant of slow growth with peoples less favoured.

ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL LAW.

Regarding criminal procedure in India, the public conscience at home has been from time to time outraged by instances that have reached us of what appeared to be undue partiality towards Europeans. A number of such cases have been summed up in a book by Ram Gopal Sanyal recently published in Calcutta. The Dum Dum and the Gantakul cases appeared to many of us in Parliament disastrous miscarriages of justice, detrimental to British prestige, the outcome of that brutal contempt for your people which is unhappily still characteristic of many ignorant and prejudiced Europeans, of that race hatred which ought to be the Government's first care to stamp out. The very appearance or suspicion of judging the efficiency of magistrates and police by their success in securing convictions ought surely to be avoided. We all hope that the Government of India, whose desire for impartiality and justice we all admit, is keenly alive to these evils and will try its best to consider favourably your representations on the subject. I trust that ere long they may be removed.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS.

We rejoiced on the adoption of Mr. Paul's motion regarding simultaneous examinations; still more at the frank spirit in which it appeared to have been accepted by the Government. We thought it a great step forward—a solid advantage gained. We have been correspondingly disappointed by the extent to which official counsels have since prevailed to the reversal by a Liberal Cabinet of the solemn decision then arrived at. Such vacillation tends to weaken the power of the House of Commons. We have lately seen it used as a reason why the Upper Chamber should properly set at naught the resolutions of the Lower. When public opinion has secured the acceptance by the House of such a great principle, it has a right to consider its work accomplished. I but voice the pain which this proceeding has caused to many of the most ardent supporters of the Government.

EDUCATION.

The education of the people claims the first attention of Government now-a-days. I regret that in your case the expenditure thereupon bears such a small proportion to that for military purposes. We must, however, individually bear in mind—at least with us in the United Kingdom there is need to bear in mind—that education in itself confers no special claim to employment by the State. Education fits us for life, and enables us the better to use and to enjoy life. It widens our horizon. But we must not expect too much from it. It should be a blessing to all; it might easily be a curse to some—if it spoiled them for the proper discharge of the simple duties that come nearest to them.

WANT OF REPRESENTATION.

After referring in detail to the drink question, the cantonments question, and the opium question, Mr. Webb proceeded: The reforms we desire are not likely to be accomplished, your cause cannot be effectually pleaded, until you are satisfactorily represented alike in your Provincial Councils and in the Imperial Parliament. In proportion as each class and each interest within the United Kingdom has come to have its voice heard in the Imperial Parliament, in just such proportion has that assembly been strengthened and dignified. That strength and that dignity will undoubtedly at some period be increased by representation from the component parts of the empire. If the empire is, as we believe it to be, one and indivisible, one indivisible spirit of liberty must pervade every portion of it. If all cannot eventually be raised to one level, all may equally be lowered. If absolutism is necessary here, absolutism will certainly taint and ultimately undermine the fabric of English liberty. Already the workings of ascendency in India have not been without their influence in retarding steady liberal progress in the United Kingdom.

TOLERATION AND CHARITY.

We may proceed to our task with hope and confidence. Within the lifetime of a generation you have obtained what may be regarded as the first instalment of reform in the direction of the expansion and reconstruction of the legislative councils, which has cost other countries centuries of toil and effort. You have every reason to be proud of what you have achieved in other directions. You must not be cooled by temporary discouragements, by the unfaithfulness of some, the want of faith of the many. Reform progresses like the steady rise of the tide through many an ebb and flow of the waves. Confident are we that through all storm and cloud the sun of constitutional liberty will yet shine with pure and beneficent effulgence upon your country. Let it be your individual care to carry back from these Congresses into every-day life and every-day occupations true elevation of mind, belief in your future and your own power to mould your future. This future depends more upon yourselves than upon any political or financial changes. Before all you must cultivate a spirit of generous toleration and of charity between class and class and creed and creed.

THE CONGRESS AND BRITISH RULE.

Here I bring to a conclusion this address, as, with the exception of a few sentences, I had prepared it in Ireland on the occasion. Since then I have landed in India, have seen some of your schools and colleges, have lingered in the crowded streets of your cities, have listened to the hum of your manufactures, have talked with your leaders, have watched the sun rise and set on the plains where such a large proportion of your population hardly wring their living from the soil. I now somewhat realise the surpassing beauty of your land. I have met you here face to face. How faint and weak, how inadequate the expression of my inmost feelings is what I have written and read, apart from those family and national ties which to each one of us are the first of life's blessings, the choicest gifts of God. I regard this visit to India, this permission to take part in the proceedings of this august assemblage as the highest privilege that has ever fallen to my lot, one that cannot but profoundly interest my remaining years. Two convictions before all others press themselves in upon me. The one, the greatness of the mission of the United Kingdom in this land, apart from its inception and much of its history. The other, that this Congress movement is the necessary and logical outcome, the richest fruit of that noble mission of which we English, Scotch, and Irish people should be proud. You yourselves are taking up the work, the work which you, and you alone can ultimately perfect—"the eradication by direct friendly intercourse of all possible race, creed or national prejudices amongst all lovers of your country." This is, in truth, the greatest combined peaceful effort for the good of the largest number of the human race that history has recorded.

SUMMARY OF RESOLUTIONS PASSED.

RESOLUTION I.

(*a*) That this Congress respectfully enters its emphatic protest against the injustice and impolicy of imposing excise duty on Cottons manufactured in British India, as such excise is calculated to cripple seriously the infant mill industry of this country.

(*b*) That this Congress puts on record its firm conviction that in proposing this excise the interests of India have been sacrificed to those of Lancashire, and it strongly deprecates any such surrender of Indian interests by the Secretary of State.

(*c*) That in case the Excise Bill becomes law this Congress earnestly prays that the Government of India will without delay seek the sanction of the Secretary of State to exercise the powers which the Bill confers on Government to exempt all Cottons from 20th to 24th from the operation of the Act.

(*d*) That the President be authorised to telegraph the above Resolution to the Government of India and to the Secretary of State.

RESOLUTION II.

(*a*) That this Congress desires to express the profound alarm which has been created by the action of Government in interfering with the existing Permanent Settlement in Bengal and Behar (in the matter of Survey and other cesses) and with the terms of sanads of permanently settled estates in Madras; and, deeming such interference with solemn pledges a national calamity, hereby pledges itself to oppose in all possible legitimate ways all such reactionary attacks on permanent settlements and their holders and resolves to petition Parliament in that behalf.

(*b*) That this Congress regrets extremely that the Government of India have not only failed to carry out the pledges (given by the Secretary of State in his despatches of 1862 and 1865) for permanent settlement in the Provinces in which it does not exist, but have also failed to give effect to the policy of granting modified fixity of tenure and immmunity from enhancements laid down in 1882 and 1884 by the Government of India and approved by the Secretary of State; and this Congress hereby entreats the Government of India to grant a modified fixity of tenure and immunity from enhancement of land tax for a sufficiently long period (of not less than sixty years) so as to secure to landholders the full benefits of their own improvements.

RESOLUTION III.

That this Congress, concurring in the views set forth in previous Congresses, affirms:

That fully fifty millions of the population, a number yearly increasing, are dragging out a miserable existence on the verge of starvation, and that in every decade several millions actually perish by starvation.

And humbly urges, once more, that immediate steps be taken to remedy this calamitous state of affairs.

RESOLUTION IV.

That this Congress considers the Abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, as at present constituted, the necessary preliminary to all other reforms: and suggests that in its place a Standing Committee of Members of the House of Commons be appointed.

RESOLUTION V.

That this Congress, while thanking Her Majesty's Government for the promise they have made to appoint a Select Committee of Members of Parliament to enquire into the financial expenditure of India, regards the enquiry with so limited a scope as inadequate, and is of opinion that if the enquiry is to bear any practical fruit it must include an enquiry into the ability of the Indian people to bear their existing financial burdens, and the financial relations between India and the United Kingdom.

RESOLUTION VI.

That this Congress expresses its deep sense of disappointment at the despatch of the Secretary of State supporting the views of the Government of India on the question of Simultaneous Examinations, and this Congress hereby places on record its respectful but firm protest against the despatch as, among other things, introducing a new principle inconsistent with the Charter Act of 1833 and the Proclamation of the Queen of 1st November, 1858, (the solemn pledges contained in which the Secretary of State and the Government of India now seek to repudiate) by creating a disability, founded upon race; for the despatch lays down that a minimum of European officials in the Covenanted Service is indispensable.

That in the opinion of this Congress the creation of the Provincial Service is no satisfactory or permanent solution of the problem, as this Service, constituted as it is at present, falls short of the legitimate aspirations of the people; and that the interests of the subordinate service will not suffer by the concession of Simultaneous Examinations.

That no attempt has been made to make out a case against the holding of Simultaneous Examinations for the recruitment of the engineering, forest, telegraph, and the higher police service examinations, and the Congress regrets to notice that the despatches of the Secretary of State, the Government of India and the various local Governments are absolutely silent with regard to this aspect of the Resolution of the House of Commons.

That this Congress respectfully urges on Her Majesty's Government that the Resolution of the House of Commons of 2nd June, 1893, on the question of Simultaneous Examinations should be speedily carried out as an act of justice to the Indian people.

RESOLUTION VII.

That this Congress views with great dissatisfaction the system of recruiting the higher Judicial Service of the country, and is of opinion that provision should be made for proper judicial training being given to persons who are appointed to the place of District and Sessions Judges and that the higher Judicial Service, in Bengal, the North-West Provinces and Oudh, Bombay and Madras, and the Judicial Service generally in other parts of the country, should be more largely recruited from the legal profession than is now the case.

RESOLUTION VIII.

(*a*) That this Congress is of opinion that the present constitution of the higher Civil Medical Service is anomalous, indefensible in principle and injurious in its working, and unnecessarily costly; that the time has arrived when, in the interests of public medical education and the advancement of medical service and of scientific work in the country as also in the cause of economic administration, the Civil Medical Service of India should be reconstructed on the basis of such service in other civilised countries, wholly detached from, and independent of, Military Service.

(*b*) That the very unsatisfactory position and prospects of members of the Subordinate Civil Medical Service (Assistant-Surgeons and Civil Hospital Assistants) compared with members of similar standing in other departments of the Public Service require thorough investigation and redress, and we pray that Government will grant for the purpose an open enquiry by a mixed Commission of official and non-official members.

(*c*) That whilst this Congress views with satisfaction the desire of the Imperial Government to reorganise the Chemical Analyser's department with a view to its administration as an independent scientific department, it earnestly hopes that Government will not fail to recognise the responsible and meritorious work of Assistants, or as they in reality are Government Chemical Analysers, and place them on the footing of Specialists.

RESOLUTION IX.

(*a*) That this Congress, in concurrence with the preceding Congress, considers that the creation of a Legislative Council for the Province of the Punjab is an absolute necessity for the good government of that Province, and, having regard to the fact that a Legislative Council has been created for the N.-W. Provinces, requests that no time should be lost in creating such a Council for the Punjab.

(*b*) That this Congress, in concurrence with the preceding Congress, is of opinion that the rules now in force under the Indian Councils Act of 1892 are materially defective, and prays that His Excellency the Viceroy in Council will be pleased to have fresh rules framed in a liberal spirit with a view to a better working of the Act and suited to the conditions and requirements of each Province.

RESOLUTION X.

That this Congress wishes to express its respectful condolence, and sympathise with the Royal Family of Mysore in their recent sad and sudden bereavement, and at the same time to testify to its deep sense of the loss which has been sustained in the death of the Máháraja of Mysore not only by the State over which he ruled with such wisdom, ability and obedience, but also by all the Indian peoples to whom his constitutional reign was at once a vindication of their political capacity, an example for their active emulation, and an earnest of their future political liberties.

RESOLUTION XI.

(*a*) That, in the opinion of the Congress, the time has now arrived when the system of trial by Jury may be safely extended, in cases triable by Sessions Courts, to many parts of the country where it is not at present in force.

(*b*) That, in the opinion of the Congress, the innovation made in 1872 in the system of trial by Jury, depriving the verdicts of Juries of all finality, has proved injurious to the country, and that the powers then, for the first time, vested in Sessions Judges and High Courts, of setting aside verdicts of acquittal, should be at once withdrawn.

(*c*) That, in the opinion of this Congress, it is extremely desirable that the power at present vested in Government to appeal against acquittals be taken away.

RESOLUTION XII.

That this Congress having till now appealed, though in vain, for many successive years to the Government of India, and also to the Secretary of State, to remove one of the gravest defects in the system of administration, one fraught with incalculable oppression to all classes of people throughout the country, and having noted with satisfaction the admission of the evil by two former Secretaries of State (Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross) and being of opinion that reform is thoroughly practicable, as was shown by Messrs. R. C. Dutt, M. M. Ghose, and P. M. Mehta, entreats the Government of India to direct the immediate appointment in each province of a Committee (one-half at least of whose members shall be non-official natives of India qualified, by education and experience in the workings of various Courts, to deal with the question) to prepare each a scheme for the complete separation of all Judicial and Executive functions in their own province with as little additional cost to the State as may be practicable, and the submission of such schemes with the opinions of the several Governments at an early date.

RESOLUTION XIII.

That this Congress affirms the opinion of the preceding Congress that the time has now come to raise the status of the Chief Court of the Punjab to that of a Chartered High Court in the interests of the administration of justice in that Province.

RESOLUTION XIV.

That having regard to the fact that the embarrassed condition of the finances of the country has been giving cause for grave anxiety for some years past, this Congress records its firm conviction that the only remedy for the present state of things is a material curtailment in the expenditure on the Army Services and other Military expenditure, Home Charges, and the cost of Civil administration, and, in view of the proposed appointment of a Parliamentary Committee to investigate the subject, this Congress strongly recommends that the Standing Congress Committees of the several Presidencies and Provinces should, so far as practicable, make arrangements to send to England at least one well qualified delegate from each Presidency or Province to urge such reduction before the Committee.

RESOLUTION XV.

That this Congress is emphatically of opinion that it is inexpedient, in the present state of education in the country, that Government grants for higher education should in any way be withdrawn, and, concurring with the previous Congresses, affirms in the most emphatic manner the importance of increasing public expenditure on all branches of education, and the expediency of establishing Technical Schools and Colleges.

RESOLUTION XVI.

That this Congress concurs with its predecessors in strongly advocating:

(*a*) The reduction of the Salt duty by at least the amount of its latest enhancement;

(*b*) The raising of the Income Tax taxable minimum from five hundred to one thousand rupees;

(*c*) The persistent pressure by the Government of India on all provincial administrations to induce them to carry out, in its integrity, the excise policy enunciated in paragraphs 103, 104, 105 of the despatch published in the *Gazette of India* of March, 1890, and the introduction of a simple system of local option in the case of all villages;

(*d*) The introduction into the Code of Criminal Procedure of a provision enabling accused persons in warrant cases to demand that instead of being tried by the magistrate they may be committed to the Court of Sessions;

(*e*) The fundamental reform of the Police Administration by a reduction in the numbers and an increase in the salaries and in the qualifications of the lower grades, and their far more careful enlistment; and by the selection for the higher posts of gentlemen of higher capacities more in touch with the respectable portions of the community and less addicted to military pretensions than the majority of existing Deputy Inspectors-General, Superintendents, and Assistant-Superintendents of Police are at present;

(*f*) A modification of the rules under the Arms Act so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to, India without distinction of creed, caste, or colour; to ensure the liberal concession of licences wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle, or crops; and to make all licences, granted under the revised rules, of life-long tenure revocable only on proof of misuse, and valid throughout the provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued;

(*g*) The establishment of Military Colleges in India whereat natives of India, as defined by statute, may be educated and trained for a military career as commissioned or non-commissioned officers (according to capacity and qualifications) of the Indian army;

(*h*) The organising throughout the more warlike races of the Empire of a system of militia services, and

(*i*) The authorising and stimulating of a widespread system of volunteering, such as obtains in Great Britain, amongst the people of India;

(*j*) The discontinuance of the Exchange Compensation allowance granted to undomiciled European and Eurasian *employés* of Government, involving an annual expenditure of over a crore of rupees while the Exchequer is in a condition of chronic embarrassment;

(*k*) The giving effect to the report of the Parliamentary members of the India Office Committee on the subject of the Rules, Orders, and Practices in Indian Cantonments with regard to Prostitution and Contagious Disease, and endorsing their conclusions:

(i) That the system and incidental practices described in that report and the statutory rules, so far as they authorised or permitted the same, did not accord with the plain meaning and intention of the resolution of the House of Commons of June 5th, 1888; and

(ii) That the only effective method of preventing these systematic malpractices is by express legislation.

RESOLUTION XVII.

That this Congress hereby empowers its President to convey to the Government of India its opinion that the powers proposed to be conferred on District Magistrates by amendments and additions to section 15 of Police Act V. of 1861, with respect to the levy of the costs of punitive police and of granting compensation, are of a most arbitrary, dangerous, and unprecedented character.

Resolution XVIII.

That this Congress records its deep-felt gratitude to the Government of India for its circular resolution No. 22/F, published in the Supplement to the *Gazette of India*, dated 20th October, 1894, and its appreciation of the generous principle which it enunciates of subordinating fiscal interests to the needs and agricultural interests of the rayat population in the management of forests;

And would further represent that in forests falling under classes 3 and 4 of the said resolutions, fuel, grazing concessions, fodder, small timber for building houses and making agricultural implements, edible forest products, etc., may be granted free of charge in all cases, under such restrictions as to quantity, etc., as the Government may deem proper; and that wherever hardship may be felt under present conditions, the policy of the said resolution may be carried out with reference to existing forest areas and existing reserve boundaries so adjusted as to leave a sufficiently large margin to facilitate the enjoyment by the agricultural population of their communal rights without molestation and annoyance by the minor subordinates of the department.

Resolution XIX.

That this Congress being of opinion that the Government of India's notification of 25th June, 1891, in the Foreign Department, gagging the press in territories under British administration in Native States, is retrograde, arbitrary, and mischievous in its nature, and opposed to sound statesmanship and to the liberty of the people, most respectfully enters its emphatic protest against the same, and entreats its cancellation without delay.

Resolution XX.

That this Congress views with apprehension the arbitrary policy of the Government with regard to the imposition of water-cess, introducing as it does a disturbing element in taxation, and suggests that the imposition of the said cess be regulated by certain defined principles, affording security to the rights of landowners and of persons investing money on land.

Resolution XXI.

That this Congress earnestly entreats Her Majesty's Government to grant the prayer of Her Majesty's Indian subjects resident in the South African colonies by vetoing the Bill of the Colonial Government disfranchising Indian subjects.

Resolution XXII.

That a deputation, consisting of the following gentlemen, be appointed for the purpose of presenting the above resolution to His Excellency Lord Elgin, and that the British Committee of the National Congress be requested to arrange a similar deputation to wait upon the Secretary of State for India in London.

From Bengal and Behar: His Highness the Máháraja Bahadur of Darbhanga, Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter, Kt., The Honourable Mr. W. C. Bonnerji, The Honourable Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji, Mr. J. Ghosal, Babu Saligram Sing, Mr. Shurrifudden, Rai Jotendranath Chaudhri, and Babu Boycuntnath Sen.

From North-West Provinces: The Honourable Raja Rampal Singh and The Honourable Babu Charu Chandra Mitter.

From Oudh: Sheikh Raja Hussein Khan, Mr. Hamid Ali Khan, and Babu Gokul Chand.

From the Punjab: Sir Dayal Singh Majithia, Babu Kali Prosonno Roy, Mr. Jussawala, Shaik Omer Buksh, Lala Murlidhur, and Bakshi Jaishi Ram.

From Bombay: The Honourable P. M. Mehta, C.I.E.

From the Central Provinces: The Honourable G. M. Chitnavis and Rai Bahadur C. Narainswami Naidu.

From Poona: Rao Bahadur V. M. Bhide, Mr. S. B. Bhate (Belgaum), Mr. N. B. Mule (Nagar), and Mr. P. L. Nagpurkar (Sholapur).

From the Berars: Rao Saheb Deorao Vinayek.

From Madras: Manivikram Raja of Calicut, The Honourable Mr. Sabapathy Mudaliar, Rao Bahadur P. Anunda Charlu, and Mr. G. Subramania Iyer.

Resolution XXIII.

That a sum of Rs. 60,000 be assigned for the expenses of the British Committee and the cost of the Congress publication India, and that the several circles do contribute as arranged, either now or hereafter, in Committee for the year 1895.

Resolution XXIV.

This Congress hereby tenders its most grateful thanks to Sir W. W. Wedderburn and the other members of the British Congress Committee for the services rendered by them to India during the present year.

Resolution XXV.

That this Congress reappoints Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., to be its General Secretary for the ensuing year.

Resolution XXVI.

That the Eleventh Indian National Congress do assemble, on such day after Christmas Day, 1895, as may be later determined upon, at Poona.

Resolution XXVII.

The Congress is of opinion that the time has come when the constitution of the Congress should be settled, and rules and regulations laid down as to the number of delegates, their qualifications, the localities for assemblage, and the like, and in this view the Congress requests the Standing Congress Committee of Poona to draw up draft rules and circulate them among the different Standing Congress Committees for their report: these reports, together with the draft rules and the report thereon, be laid before the next Congress for its consideration.

Alfred Webb.
President of the Tenth Indian National Congress.

Madras, 29th December, 1894.

THEOSOPHISTRY.

A Modern Priestess of Isis. Abridged and translated, on behalf of the Society for Psychical Research, from the Russian of Vsevolod Sergyeevich Solovyoff, by Walter Leaf, Litt. D. With appendices. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Ten years have now elapsed since the Society for Psychical Research weighed the claims of the Theosophists in its balance and found them wanting. An impartial reader of Dr. Hodgson's careful report could feel little doubt as to the fraudulence of the methods they employed to obtain their so-called "phenomena." Mr. V. S. Solovyoff appears in that report as the writer of a letter which relates a curious incident in his own history. He was a friend of Madame Blavatsky, in fact, as he writes, "apart from Helena Petrovna's own family, I am the only Russian who knew her intimately and well in the period from 1884-86,"—the period, that is, which followed her appearance in Europe from India, and during which there started up the European "Theosophical Societies." As to his experiences during this time with few exceptions Mr. Solovyoff kept silence until 1892 when, in consequence of reports in the Russian papers relative to "phenomena" performed by Madame Blavatsky, he deemed it his duty to make public the information he possessed. He, therefore, contributed eight articles to the *Russky Vyestnik*, entitled, "The Modern Priestess of Isis." The whole account, since published in book form, furnishes so remarkable a corroboration of Dr. Hodgson's investigations that the Council of the Society for Psychical Research requested Dr. Leaf to translate it into English and it is at its instigation that the book, in an abridged form, is now published.

The story begins with Mr. Solovyoff's introduction to Madame Blavatsky and the earlier chapters describe "phenomena" which he witnessed and which have previously been discussed in different articles. He felt at once Madame Blavatsky's personal charm, and exclaims after recounting his first interview: "and herself? How came it that this old, ill-favoured woman had such a peculiar attraction? How comes this peculiar, humorous good-nature and simplicity to be combined in her with the sort of painful mystery hidden in her wonderful eyes? However that might be, though I was thoroughly dissatisfied, I felt one thing: that I was drawn to her, and I was interested in her, and that I should look forward with impatience to the hour when I should see her again." On his next visit, in spite of this dissatisfaction, he was enrolled a member of the Theosophical Society. He was introduced to Colonel Olcott and to the members of the Paris Society, and experienced several "phenomena," about which however he was somewhat sceptical. His scepticism at this time appears nevertheless to have been exaggerated in the light of subsequent events. In August of the same year, when he was in Elberfeld, Mahatma Morya "appeared" to him under circumstances which led the Society for Psychical Research to ascribe the appearance to a vivid dream. As a result of a communication from Mr. Solovyoff, the society added that in the light of events which have since occurred "he no longer regards his experience as affording any evidence of occult agency." From the account now offered it would seem that he had never regarded the occurrence in this way. In the following year, after Madame Blavatsky's return from India, and after the enquiry of the Society for Psychical Research, Mr. Solovyoff met her at Würzburg. He had, in the meantime, refrained from resigning his position as a member of the Theosophical Society only on account of the friendship he felt for Madame Blavatsky personally. She attempted to convince him by her "phenomena," failed, and then made a remarkable confession, the account of which rests on Mr. Solovyoff's authority alone, and which has been denied by her followers. Her admissions were induced, he says, by a confession of "broad-mindedness" on his part. Led to believe him a willing accomplice she is said to have disclosed her deceptions, to have remarked how unobservant people were and how easy it was to trick them, and to have begged him to help her in Russia. "I had no longer," says Mr. Solovyoff, "the strength to sustain my part." It was not a pleasant part to sustain. He had still to obtain documentary evidence, and later he received this evidence in the reply to a letter which advised Madame Blavatsky to abandon deception and depend solely upon her literary skill. The genuineness of the confession has been questioned by Madame Jelihovsky and Theosophists in general, in spite of the fact that the translation made from it by Mr. Solovyoff was attested by M. Jules Baissac.

There still remained one ground for the Theosophical Society, and one only. Madame Blavatsky might have been an ardent reformer, tempted to deceit, as we may gather from her confession, by what appeared to her to be the overwhelming necessity of convincing people by showing them some new thing. But, if so, the foundation of her Society should have been other than it is here shown to be with a fulness of detail which is absent from the accounts of Mr. Sinnett and others. It has been the cue of champions of Theosophy since 1885 to minimise the importance of "phenomena". Mr. Old, for instance, declares in his exposition: "The Theosophist finds the value of his philosophy in its universal application to the problems of human life and thought. . . . . It is folly to suppose Theosophists insist upon the superlative value of one phenomenon that may incidentally have had public mention". Perhaps the reason why Theosophy will soon become a dead letter lies not so much in the proofs of trickery as in the fact that its foundress, its inspiring spirit, has gone—a woman who could actually persuade Mrs. Besant to exclaim on reading the Report of the Society for Psychical Research: "Quickly I saw how slender was the foundation on which the imposing structure was built". The personal influence of Madame Blavatsky has gone. Her voluminous compilations of ancient and modern philosophy cannot replace it. Mr. Solovyoff's book furnishes us with a picture of a powerful personality which may well lead us to agree that "she has achieved a title to permanent remembrance as one of the most accomplished, ingenious, and interesting impostors in history".

Printed by A. BONNER, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 3. (NEW SERIES.)] MARCH, 1895. [SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus"	65
The War in Waziristan	72
The Teachings of the Vedas	75
OUR LONDON LETTER	75
Mr. Fowler's Optimism: Sir Auckland Colvin's Reply	77
REVIEWS: Macmillan's "Indian Studies"	78
John Russell Colvin	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	80
THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT IN INDIA, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	81
THE EXERCISE OF ARBITRARY POWER IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INDIA, by J. Dacosta	82
INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS: Luncheon to Mr. A. Webb, M.P., at the National Liberal Club	84
,, ,, Opinions of the Press	90
Interview with Mr. A. Webb, M.P.	91
Mr. A. Webb, M.P., at Bombay: Farewell Address	93

Indiana.

India has been very much to the fore in British politics during the last few days. Indeed there was, at one time, a distinct possibility that the Government would be defeated on account of the imposition of the import duty on cotton goods. This calamity was averted, but it is interesting to remember that it is on an Indian question—namely, simultaneous examinations—that the Government has suffered its only serious defeat. On February 21st, Sir Henry James, who was returned for Bury chiefly by the votes of textile operatives, moved the adjournment of the House of Commons in order to call attention to the inclusion of cotton goods in the scope of Sir James Westland's import duty. There is no reason to doubt that, if Lancashire Liberal members had been willing to vote against the Government in sufficient numbers to defeat it with the aid of Conservative votes, that aid would have been cheerfully given. But the discreditable manœuvre, in which Mr. Chamberlain is believed to have played a leading part, broke down, partly because only four Liberal members would vote against the Government, partly because Mr. Fowler's admirable speech—perhaps the best that he has delivered as Secretary of State for India—recalled at least a considerable number of Conservatives to a sense of duty. A not inopportune attack of influenza prevented Mr. Balfour from attending the House, but Lord George Hamilton, who joined in the attack upon Mr. Fowler, went out of his way to declare that he had the full approval of Lord Salisbury. It is worth noting also that a five-lined whip was issued to the Conservative party, that the Conservative Whips and Lord Cranborne, Lord Salisbury's eldest son, voted against the Government, and that the Conservative papers with one accord refrained from saying a single word before the division to dissuade members of their party from taking this dangerous and unpatriotic course. After the division, it is true, these journals vented righteous if belated indignation upon the 107 Unionists who had supported Sir H. James's separatist motion.

Sir H. James's motion was rejected by 195 votes, and while 101 Conservatives and six Liberal Unionists voted against the Import Duty, only 51 Conservatives and 14 Liberal Unionists voted in support of it. Strangely enough, Sir Richard Temple went into the lobby in favour of making India insolvent. Of the debate itself it is not necessary to say much. The subject has already been fully discussed in the columns of INDIA. Sir H. James's speech was tedious and dull, and suffered by contrast with the lucid and vigorous reply of the Secretary of State. Indians may be amused to find that, while they regard the countervailing Excise Duty as an unwarrantable concession to the demands of Lancashire, Lancashire members in the proportion of 23 to 13 condemn Mr. Fowler for injuring the interests of their constituents. Mr. Fowler made no attempt to explain how the countervailing Excise Duty can be justified on the theory, recently propounded by Mr. Asquith, "that what we have to regard are the interests of the Indian people, and if in those interests fiscal measures, even though they be injurious to British trade, require to be adopted, both policy and honour demand from us that we should make the sacrifice." The debate had the advantage of bringing the financial condition of India prominently before the notice of the British public, but perhaps it is too much to hope that curiosity will spread from the symptom to the cause, and that a serious endeavour will be made to enforce that policy of economy without which the financial difficulties of India must be permanent. Mr. Fowler is apparently in no hurry to fulfil the promise which he gave last summer that "at the very commencement" of the present Session he would move for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the expenditure of the Indian revenues. It seems that after all a Royal Commission may be appointed. Each instrument of inquiry has its peculiar advantages, and either one or the other should be set to work without further delay.

"I am not a pessimist," said Mr. Fowler a month ago in his speech at the dinner of the Northbrook Society to Lord Sandhurst. He is not indeed. On the contrary, so far as India is concerned, he is an incorrigible optimist. He has nothing but amused contempt for the theory that India is on the verge of bankruptcy:

> "I understand a bankrupt to be a man who cannot pay his debts, whose liabilities exceed his assets, or he is living beyond income, and that in a very short time the end will come. Now, when these statements are made that India is in that position I think that for one moment I may be pardoned upon an occasion like this in saying why—feeling all the responsibility of the office which I hold—I deny both those statements. The debt of India, which, of course, if we are a bankrupt State we cannot pay, is 105 millions of tens of rupees in India and 116 millions sterling in England; the entire debt to-day being 221 millions, and that is taking the rupee at its old value of ten rupees to a sovereign. Now, what are the assets against this liability? I ventured to say in the House of Commons six or seven months ago: 'I know of no country where the assets are so nearly approaching the liabilities as in the case of India.' (Cheers.) The assets are 140 millions in railways, 29½ millions in irrigation works, and both these assets are assets producing income; and 16 millions is lent to municipal and other public bodies. These items amount to 185½ millions; and, therefore, the uncovered debt of India is to-day 35¾ millions. That is the real liability of the people of India, of the credit of India, of the resources of India—a sum not amounting to 40 millions sterling. To talk of bankruptcy under these circumstances is talking nonsense."

This amiable description of the position of India is analysed and exploded by the able and candid financier who edits the *Investors' Review*. Mr. Fowler continued his discourse with a reference to the "enormous strain that has been placed upon Indian finance by the depreciation in the value of the rupee." Mr. A. J. Wilson replies that that depreciation itself "is the most striking and obvious proof which could be given that India is going bankrupt." Mr. Fowler says that a bankrupt is a man who cannot pay his bebts. So be it. But does India pay her debts? Why, within the last two years, as Mr. Wilson points out, she has borrowed £6,000,000 in London and has still a large deficit which must be met by further borrowing. These loans conceal the true amount of the deficit in India. Mr. Wilson estimates that if India had paid her debts in London in full, her deficit during the last two years would have amounted to not less than Rs. 200,000,000. Mr. Fowler asserts triumphantly that the assets of India equal, or nearly equal, her liabilities. Mr. Wilson reminds him that there never is a big bankruptcy in which the assets do not exceed the liabilities. But the difficulty is that the assets cannot be realised. "That is just the position of India, and the income from her assets is insufficient to cover the liabilities the possession of them involves." Mr. Fowler consoles himself with the reflection that at no preceding period have the English people taken such an interest in the affairs of India as they take to-day. But this interest was largely aroused by the imposition of import duties which Mr. Fowler justified on the ground that the Finance Minister in India was at his wits' end to obtain revenue in order to meet a deficit.

It is to be regretted that the discussion upon Mr. Naoroji's amendment to the Address failed to extract from Mr. Fowler any more satisfactory assurances in regard to the forthcoming Committee on Indian expenditure. The India Office appears to intend that the investigations of the Committee shall not only have nothing to say to the ability or inability of India to bear her present burdens, but, even in the matter of expenditure, shall also be restricted to something very like a mere audit of accounts. Mr. Naoroji's amendment, which was seconded by Sir W. Wedderburn, and supported by Sir D. Macfarlane, Mr. Seymour Keay, and Mr. Alfred Webb, was as follows:—

> "And we humbly pray that your Majesty will be graciously pleased to direct your Majesty's Ministers to so adjust the financial relations between the United Kingdom and British India with regard to all the expenditure incurred in the employment of Europeans in the British-Indian Services, civil and military, in this country and in India, that some fair and adequate portion of such expenditure should be borne by the British Exchequer in proportion to the pecuniary and political benefits accruing to the United Kingdom from your Gracious Majesty's sway over India; and that the British Treasury should sustain a fair and equitable portion of all expenditure incurred on all military and political operations beyond the boundaries of India in which both Indian and British interests are jointly concerned.".

It will be remembered that the great meeting of the cotton interest which was recently held at Manchester suggested an Imperial subsidy to India as a substitute for import duties. Mr. Naoroji did not ask for a subsidy, but for a fair return for value received. Mr. Fowler's speech in reply was a remarkable exhibition alike of his own optimism and of the peculiar controversial methods of the India Office. He made a show of testing the value of Mr. Naoroji's conclusions by impugning the accuracy of his figures. Mr. Naoroji's figures, which were misreported by the *Times*, were strictly accurate. They were taken from the Parliamentary Return 192, dated India Office, 13 May, 1892, and entitled "East India (Salaries)." The amendment referred to "the expenditure incurred in the employment of Europeans in the British-Indian Services, civil and military, in this country and in India." The Parliamentary Return, which has to do only with amounts of not less than 1,000 rupees, shows that this expenditure exceeds Rs. 170,000,000. This was the amount cited by Mr. Naoroji; and a low estimate of the salaries below 1,000 rupees would yield at least Rs. 30,000,000 more, bringing the total up to Rs. 200,000,000. Mr. Fowler's reply, if reply it can be called, referred to the cost of civil establishments alone, and to these in India alone. Such a reply was not at all relevant, and not entirely fair. Similarly, the Parliamentary Return mentioned above shows that the number of "Europeans in the British-Indian Services, civil and military, in this country and in India" receiving salaries of not less than Rs. 1,000 is 29,467, while the number of Eurasians is 6,414, and of natives 17,960. Mr. Fowler's reply, which was again irrelevant, dealt only with the Civil Service, and with that only in India. Mr. Naoroji stated, with strict accuracy, that the gross Indian revenue was Rx. 70,000,000. Mr. Fowler estimates it at Rx. 50,000,000. But he refuses to include land-revenue, and his comparison of taxation in the United Kingdom and in India is vitiated by the fact that he contrasts net revenue in India with something more than the gross revenue of the United Kingdom. The methods of the India Office may be ingenious, but they are not "furthersome."

Special interest attaches to the farewell address delivered by Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., at Bombay, and reproduced elsewhere in our columns. The President of the Tenth Congress went to India a stranger, and the address which he delivered at Madras was, for the most part, composed before he had set eyes upon Indian soil. Mr. Webb left India with the reluctance of a friend:—

> "It is not without a pang I quit your shores. Now that the time of departure draws near I find myself saying: 'But two more Indian sunrises, but two more Indian sunsets, but a few more hours of sojourn in that land where I have been treated with such unstinted kindness and boundless consideration.' I can find no better words with which to conclude than some previously given expression to by me. Apart from those family and national ties which to each of us are the first of life's blessings, the choicest gifts of God, I regard this visit to India, this meeting you face to face, this widening of my mental horizon as the highest privilege and one that cannot but profoundly influence my remaining years."

During his brief stay in India Mr. Webb travelled over 3,000 miles and at the end of his visit, crowded with observation as it was, he was surprised to find how little he wished to alter in his Presidential address. The literary exponents of Anglo-Indian officialism are fond of saying that nobody understands India except the globe-trotter who is there to-day and gone to-morrow. "After thirty years in India" one of Mr. Webb's fellow-passengers kindly informed him "you find you know nothing whatever about it." Mr. Webb, in whom there is no guile, estimates this fantastic affectation of modest nescience at its true value. "It would be better," he says, "if such gentlemen said at once what they mean—that no one but a paid official of the Government has ever any right to strive to know anything about India." The cant of philosophic doubt may do very well for the man on the fence, but it will not do for politicians who have to make up their minds and to act. It is not only self-styled "experts" who enjoy the privilege, and possess the faculty, of estimating evidence. Mr. Webb reminds us of Mr. John Morley's dictum that in the United Kingdom one generation after another of cobblers have proved themselves more capable of judging as to the right and wrong of complicated political questions than generation after generation of University graduates.

That Mr. Webb employed his time in India to some purpose nobody who reads his remarkable trilogy on Indian affairs will doubt. He adheres to all that he said about the general character of the Indian Civil Service. "There has," he thinks, "never been any service to equal it. Never, until upon the passage out, did I find myself amongst such a number of strong, trained, able, resourceful men." At the same time Mr. Webb would have Anglo-Indian officials remember that, while they are a splendid instrument, they are not the people of India; that they live for India, India does not live for them. He fears, with only too much reason, that many of them do not realize adequately their position in the country, and do not show enough consideration for the masses of the people. No mistake could be more calamitous and, as it is often unconscious, there are no limits to its possible extent. The quality in the speeches delivered at the Congress which specially struck Mr. Webb was their moderation. He even expresses the opinion that Englishmen, discussing subjects of similar importance in England, would not exhibit moderation in the same degree. Some Anglo-Indian critics professed that Mr. Webb had been asked to curse and remained to bless, and that the moderation of his own utterances disappointed the leaders of educated Indian opinion. No calumny could be farther from the truth. Mr. Webb declares that alike in public and in private it was his most moderate utterances which were best received. His testimony as to the poverty of the Indian people is specially valuable and noteworthy :—

> "If from India I carry away any one impression more definite than another, it is concerning the miserable state in which most of your population appear to be immersed. The evidence of my senses ill accorded with the roseate pictures drawn by ex-officials in the House of Commons."

Mr. Webb's detailed observations on this important subject are reproduced in another column, and they form a sufficient and significant answer to the incorrigible optimism of the India Office.

In regard to education Mr. Webb, in common with all other competent observers, would deplore the possibility of any curtailment of the Government grants. Between 1883-4 and 1892-3 these grants increased from Rx. 2,171,000 to Rx. 3,185,000. In the same period military expenditure in India rose from Rx. 17,155,000 to Rx. 23,012,000. While in England public expenditure upon education amounts 28 per cent. of the military expenditure, in India, where State aid is more necessary, it amounts only to 13 per cent.

> "It appears to me," says Mr. Webb, "that technical education is the education here most required. Day by day engineering and mechanical pursuits are affording wider fields for the employment of your young men. It is of importance that they should be attracted into them, that they should learn that they are as honourable a means of living as, and often more independent than, others generally considered more gentlemanly. An English locomotive superintendent on one of your principal lines lamented to me the difficulty of procuring native *employés* in what is a comparatively well-paid calling. An English head gardener spoke similarly with regard to his business."

Mr. Webb referred in terms of high praise to the technical schools at Baroda and at Itarsi, and expressed the natural opinion that what is possible in a native State and at the hands of a small religious society should be possible generally at the hands of the Imperial Government. As to simultaneous examinations, Mr. Webb finds that "there is no question upon which the Civil Service appears more united than in its opposition" to the resolution of the House of Commons. That opposition will have to be removed or ignored. Finally, Mr. Webb exhorts Indians to "hold to this Congress movement as your sheet anchor and sure shield of defence: nothing can imperil or destroy its existence but the abandonment of the safe lines upon which you have hitherto proceeded."

A Bombay correspondent writes, under date January 18th: "Yesterday we had a most successful meeting, which over two thousand people attended. Mr. Webb delivered his farewell address, which, like the Presidential address at Madras, was full of common sense and practical reflections. His opponents were obliged to confess his Madras performance an able one, and I am sure this will be considered equally able. There is no doubt that Mr. Webb is a man of great natural talents and fire. He has really lifted the Congress to a higher platform. What Mr. Yule did in 1888, Mr. Webb has done in 1894, and India is extremely grateful to Mr. Naoroji and Mr. Hume, as well as to Sir W. Wedderburn, for the wise and happy choice they made. Our Bombay address was in a way even better and more practical than the Madras address. The latter was written out before Mr. Webb had set foot on the soil of India, while the former was written after he had seen the country and personally conversed with natives of all shades of opinion, officials and non-officials. Lord Harris wrote a very cordial letter to Mr. Webb yesterday, and invited him to dinner. Mr. Webb is going to Government House to-night. In his address last night he gave credit to the Congress for its moderation and lauds its organisation. He told us that it was our sheet anchor and shield of defence. When he came to this part there were deafening cheers, which echoed through the gallery and outside the Gaiety Theatre where we held the meeting."

The *Daily News* was probably not far wrong when it wrote that the luncheon which was given in honour of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., at the National Liberal Club on February 18th, may hereafter rank as a political event of no slight importance. We print elsewhere a full report of the many interesting speeches which were delivered, but the importance of the occasion did not consist in the speeches alone. A large number of members of Parliament were present, and many Indians who are now resident in London. It did not require a vivid imagination to forecast happy issues from so cordial and representative a re-union. The luncheon was given by a few of Mr. Webb's friends who are interested in India, on the occasion of his return from India as President of the Tenth Congress, and Sir William Wedderburn, M.P., and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., acted as joint secretaries. The prevailing note was one of hearty good will towards the people of India and of admiration for the able way in which Mr. Webb discharged the varied duties of President of the Congress. Mr. Michael Davitt's unadvoidable absence was to be regretted, but he wrote an admirable letter which described faithfully the disposition of Irishmen towards India.

> "All Irish Home Rulers are," he said, "naturally proud of the part which Mr. Webb has played in the recent National Congress at Madras, and as we are all friends of India we all rejoiced to know that our distinguished countryman has rendered a signal service to the national cause of India by his able and unanswerable address in support of the principles and programme of the Congress movement."

Mr. Stansfeld, who presided, and whose intention to retire from Parliament is universally deplored, quoted with approval those passages in Mr. Webb's Presidential address which bade the Indian peoples turn deaf ears to the doctrines of despair and recognised the merits of the Indian Civil Service and the conscience that its members bring to their task of government. Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., expressed the opinion of all who were present when he declared that Mr. Webb had shown the moderation and the sagacity of genuine statesmanship. Edmund Burke is not the only Irishman who has taken a deep and sympathetic interest in the welfare of India. Nationalist Ireland has, as Mr. McCarthy said, always been in sympathy with the aspirations of India, and her representatives in the House of Commons are giving invaluable aid to the cause of Indian reform.

The speech which Mr. Webb delivered in reply to the toast of his health takes rank with the notable address which he delivered at Bombay on the eve of his departure from India. A man of transparent modesty, of critical judgment, and withal of the strongest sympathies, Mr. Webb declared that he came back humbled rather than elated—

> "humbled to think what a small portion of my attention has hitherto been given to the interests of three hundred millions of our fellow-subjects: not elated when I remember how little of the success of the Congress was due to my own puny efforts."

Mr. Webb had nothing but praise, which Mr. Naoroji gratefully acknowledged, for the moderation and excellent organisation of the Congress, while, in regard to the Indians whom he met, he says that to move among them and to look into their faces was to learn to love them with a real brotherly affection. Side by side with this noble sentiment one may well place the statesmanlike utterance of Mr. A. E. Fletcher that Englishmen will never solve Indian problems until they carry out the true imperial idea that empires, like individuals, should learn not to be envied and feared, but to be trusted and loved. One of the most noteworthy passages in Mr. Webb's speech was that in which he referred to the waste of force that is caused by a sense of distrust and suspicion :—

> "As President of the Congress I was greatly impressed, as all through my life in Ireland, with the wealth of intellectual sagacity and devotion which, instead of being made use of for the good of the nations and the empire, lies fallow and unused. In Great Britain and her self-governing colonies this intellectual wealth is freely expended for the good of the community, while in Ireland and in India it is forced into private channels or distilled into bitterness."

Mr. George Russell excited some merriment by reading a letter which he had received from a friend in the India Office. The matter for congratulation is that the sentiments at which the official jeered do not inexactly represent Mr. Russell's wishes in regard to India.

Sir W. W. Hunter, whose speech will dwell in the memory of all that heard it, declared amid cheers that no man was "more desirous to promote the progress of the Indian race." He reminded his audience how, ten years ago, Sir W. Wedderburn and he, as Indian civilians, held out the hand of welcome to the movement which became the Indian National Congress. Sir W. Hunter went further and, with the approval of everybody, and especially Mr. Stansfeld himself, gently rebuked the Chairman for inadvertently applying the term subject-races to our fellow-subjects in India.

> "If," said Sir W. Hunter, "I were asked as an historical student to discriminate between the dynasties of India in the past and the dynasty of India at present, I should say that the great difference lies in the fact that the previous Indian dynasties have regarded the larger portion of the Indian population as subject races, whereas we regard them as fellow-subjects."

Coming from the authority they do, these are significant and memorable words. Sir W. Hunter counselled the Congress to continue in those lines of reasonableness and moderation to which Mr. Webb has borne repeated testimony, and which are cordially acknowledged by all frank and impartial critics. The case for the Congress, so to speak, was fittingly closed by Sir W. Wedderburn, who, as Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, and of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, may be said to be the embodiment of the policy of sympathy and co-operation that he advocates between Parliament and Indian public opinion. The presence of Mr. Webb at the Madras Congress exemplified and stimulated the same wise policy. Nothing certainly could be more foolish, or more suicidal, than that Parliament and her servants in India should manifest an attitude of coldness, of aloofness, or of indifference to the reasonable wishes and the practical suggestions of organised public opinion in India. It is not too much to say that the bonds of friendship, of mutual confidence, and of common effort towards great ends, will have been drawn closer by the important and interesting gathering at the National Liberal Club.

The leaders of public opinion in India will note with pleasure that the speeches which were delivered at the National Liberal Club on February 18th. received considerable attention in the British press. The *Times*, it is true, declined to send a reporter, but the *Daily News*, the *Daily Chronicle*, and the *Manchester Guardian* gave good reports of the meeting and discussed it in their editorial columns. The *Manchester Guardian* in a suggestive article referred to the extent to which Indian methods of Government and the habits of mind derived from their practice colour the political views of Englishmen influential in politics at home. The matter is well worthy of consideration. "Our system of Government in India is" as the *Guardian* says "one of the tributaries which feed the stream of anti-democratic feeling among well-to-do English people of the 'professional' class or thereabouts, and a dim sense of this fact has no doubt a good deal to do with the rising inclination of English Liberals to criticise Indian administration with some severity." In this connection I may remind my readers of an article by Mr. J. E. Mathieson which, under the title "Concerning Anglo-Indians," appeared in the May number of INDIA last year (p. 147). Referring to returned Anglo-Indians Mr. Mathieson asked.—

> "Is it not the case that their Indian point of view in regard to the common people is warped and coloured adversely to popular movements, and that the weight of their influence and opinions is on the side of reaction and the refusal of popular claims? Remember that this has been going on now for generations; that few upper or middle-class families have not some connection or relative in the Indian Services, and we can at once perceive how widely the sentiments of this class of men may have prevailed to influence public opinion in a direction contrary to the reform of abuses. Our political leaders have to reckon with this element in the body politic."

The statesmanlike, courageous and eloquent speeches which Mr. P. M. Mehta delivered at a meeting of the Viceroy's Legislative Council at the close of January have caused an amusing flutter in the dovecotes of Anglo-Indian bureaucracy. The first speech referred to the Cantonments Bill, which has been passed into law in accordance with resolutions of the House of Commons and the recommendations of Mr. George Russell's Committee, but in the teeth of opposition from some heaven-born officials in India. Mr. Mehta, whose speeches received the universal and enthusiastic approval of educated public opinion in India, reminded his colleagues in the Viceroy's Council that, after all, "the supreme and absolute authority for the government of this country vests in Parliament." Home Rule for India, he declared, could only mean, for a long time to come, "the substitution of the rule of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy for that of the House of Commons and the Secretary of State as controlled by it." Mr. Mehta added that

> "it is safer to rest upon the ultimate sense of justice and righteousness of the whole English people, which in the end always asserts its nobility, than upon the uncontrolled tendencies of an officialdom trained in bureaucratic methods, and not free from the demoralising prejudices incident to their position in the country."

In the second speech, discussing the Police Amendment—that is to say, the "Coercion"—Bill, Mr. Mehta dotted the i's and crossed the t's of this timely warning. The Bill represents, as he said, an attempt, under cover of executive measures for the preservation of order, to convict and punish individuals without judicial trial. Mr. Mehta rightly condemned the measure not only as retrogade in itself but as likely also to demoralise the executive officers whom it concerned.

> "I have not the least desire to speak disparagingly of executive officers, most of whom, I have no doubt, are anxious to perform their duties conscientiously and to the best of their ability. But it would be idle to believe that they can be free from the biases, the prejudices, and the defects of their class and position. It is a more common human failing than most people imagine, to mistake suspicious—not unfrequently founded on prejudice and on misleading, unsifted, and incorrect information—for moral certainty."

This speech kindled the ire of Sir James Westland who, in tones of threatrical declamation, described Mr. Mehta's temperate criticisms as "calumnies," "extraordinary observations," and "one general, all-comprehensive accusation impugning not only the capacity but even the honesty and fairness of the members of the most distinguished Service in the world." Sir James Westland's tirade was of course gratuitous and ridiculous, and its author has since discovered that public opinion in India is against him and with Mr. Mehta. The truth is that our servants in India are not content to be servants at all. Their pretensions are of higher reach and ampler bulge. On one side they claim—as witness their action in regard to simultaneous examinations and the Cantonments Bill—power to ignore Parliament, while on the other side they seek—as witness the Police Amendment Bill—freedom to work their own sweet will upon our Indian fellow-subjects. Their motto would appear to be *Imperium et Libertas* in a special and dangerous sense of those words. It is the sort of pride that goes before a fall.

With reference to this important matter, a Bombay correspondent writes:—Beyond the personal aspect of the incident there are important points at issue:—

> (i.) The present conflict between the Government of India on the one side and the House of Commons on the other;
>
> (ii.) The present conflict between the bureaucracy in India and the educated Indians who agitate for reforms, and especially the Congress.

Mr. Mehta plainly told the members of the Council that if the Secretary of State had dictated some of the sections of the Cantonments Bill it was but natural after the experience he had had of the way in which Parliamentary resolutions were treated by the official hierarchy in India. The constant effort of this body is to override such orders and instructions, if it cannot evade them by some technical loophole. Mr. Mehta admitted that in rare cases Parliament is swayed by selfish influences. But generally its august authority is of the greatest service to India. All this was gall and wormwood to the bureaucracy. Jesuits in politics as they are, they have been using the Excise Bill and the Cantonments Bill as a handle to discredit Parliamentary interference as dangerous to the Empire. They want to make this their battle-cry at the present critical juncture, and force the hands of the Secretary of State. In short, the secret strategy is to undermine Parliamentary influence, if not to supplant it altogether, and establish the influence of the bureaucracy so as to oppress our people more, and lay the foundation of a tyranny pure and simple in this country. The governing caste of white Brahmans want to set up here a sort of independent despotism, free from the shackles of the House of Commons."

"The Police Amendment Bill," my correspondent continues, "contemplates absolute arrest of the best citizens under an executive act, and their condemnation without regular judicial procedure. The whole thing is un-English. But the secret aim of the Government of India for many years has been to put a halter round the neck of the Indian, so as to keep him an 'abject slave'—to use Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's phrase—for all times. It was against this spirit that Mr. Mehta directed his criticism. Sir J. Westland tried to intimidate native Councillors by his indignation, vainly thinking that no other member would ever again dare raise his voice against the Government in a similar fashion. Deluded legislator! He hardly understands the spirit of the times and the revolution going on in the mind of educated India. The official fear of Parliamentary interference is aggravated by the strength with which enlightened India is gradually asserting itself. It is not only asserting its self-respect, but showing its power and influence. That power and influence have been seen for the last ten years in our annual Congresses. The Government sees that the Congress movement grows with the growth of years, and that its power to influence Parliament is increasing. It sees that we are asserting our claim for higher employment, and that we are crying out for an intelligent criticism of the Budget and a vote on it, for persistent interpellation, and for a variety of constitutional reforms which, of course, must curtail the power of the bureaucracy. Hence all the efforts to put us down. The attack on Mr. Mehta is really an attack on the Indian reform agitation all along the line. The conflict has begun. Where it will end one cannot say."

As will be seen from our Parliamentary supplement, Sir W. Wedderburn has put a further question to Mr. Fowler on the subject of the dismissal of Mr. Arthur Rogers from his post as an engineer on the Bengal and North Western Railway. Mr. Fowler's reply, which is merely an echo of an official evasion previously attempted in India, is exceedingly unsatisfactory, and the matter certainly cannot rest here. The allegation, for which there appears to be only too much ground, is that Mr. Rogers, to whose thorough competence and energy his late employers testify, was dismissed at the request or suggestion of Sir Charles Elliott and Sir Charles Crosthwaite. Mr. Rogers had previously been used ill, to say the least of it, in respect of an ingenious contrivance of his for the supply of compressed forage to Indian troops. Once bit he was twice shy, and, although long study of the question and close association with native Indian opinion had placed him in possession of a remedy for religious disturbances in India, he hesitated to communicate with the Government of India, until he received a guarantee against persecution. Certain papers of his, however, were illegally seized, and his hand was forced. A question was put in the House of Commons as to Mr. Rogers's scheme for preventing religious riots, and his dismissal followed immediately. That is the reward of a benefactor to whose ability and zeal many officials bear testimony, and a more painful mystery, for mystery it still is in some ways, it would be hard to conceive. If this is the reward of attempts at conciliation, nobody can wonder that religious riots still occur in India. Mr. Rogers's remedy, into which I need not now enter, is to revert to the wisdom of the Mughal Emperors, and he has been able, by means of it, to avert collisions and to render signal service to the cause of public order in India. That such a man should suffer for such benefactions, simply because he may have run counter to the prejudices of certain officials, is monstrous, and the matter calls for prompt action on the part of Mr. Fowler and the House of Commons.

The *Daily Chronicle* of February 15th published a leading article on the dimissal of Mr. Rogers. After referring to the testimonials of officials to Mr. Rogers's ability and services, the article continued:—

"Why, then, should Mr. Rogers have hesitated to communicate with the Government of India? 'My experience,' he says, in his petition to the Secretary of State, dated August 21st, 1894, 'enabled me to foresee that a time would come when some powerful official, or clique, would misunderstand and resent my private life-long interest in such matters, and that is the reason why I did not at first voluntarily offer suggestions (which I knew would be most unpalatable to certain officials) to Government as to the causes of unrest at work in India and the simple remedies for them; and I should not have done so at all until I had procured a guarantee from persecution from his Excellency the Viceroy, had not certain papers of mine been illegally seized by the Bengal Government, and my hand forced against my will.' The papers thus illegally seized were restored with apologies. More than that, Mr. Rogers's measures, in a mutilated form, have been partially introduced by two Local Governments, much to the satisfaction of all parties concerned. The Viceroy in Council is understood to approve of them. Sir W. B. Hudson, President of the Behar Indigo Planters' Association, is satisfied, on communication with both Hindus and Muhammadans, that they 'are well calculated to afford the relief that is needed.' The leaders of both the religious parties concur. Why, then, should such a benefactor of the Government and of the country be hounded from pillar to post with barbarous ingratitude? And why has the Secretary of State not yet dealt with his petition? Who is the 'powerful official' Mr. Rogers refers to? Who are 'the clique?'"

On January 11th an Indian of remarkable capacity and energy passed away. Babu Protap Chandra Rai began life as a compositor in a Calcutta printing office. He devoted his spare hours to the acquisition of learning, and in course of time started business as a bookseller and general agent. By assiduity and good judgment he accumulated sufficient money to enable him to retire from business; but he resolved instead to exert himself to arrest the decay of religious feeling in his country. His first work was a translation of the whole Mahábhárata into Bengali, which he published at a nominal price. This work occupied about seven years of his life, and then a severe domestic calamity overtook him. He wandered about the country for a time broken-hearted, and almost demented; but his great project at length brought him back to his work, and he began to exhort the people in the villages through which he roamed to set apart every day a handful of rice, and thus raise the small sum needed for a copy of the sacred book. He returned to Calcutta, and devoted his life and his wealth to the task he had taken in hand. Distributing gratuitously all the remaining copies of his Mahábhárata, he immediately set to work upon a second edition of 3,000 copies. The great idea rapidly expanded, and he resolved to establish a permanent institution for the gratuitous distribution of the religious books of India. His enthusiasm spread to others, and contributions of money were made by wealthy Hindus. Fresh editions of the Mahábhárata and an edition of the Harivansa followed, and then the work of Valmíki—the Rámáyana—was published in Sanskrit, along with a Bengali translation.

Many thousands of these famous works have been given away and sold at nominal prices, but the work which has given to Protap Chandra Rai a world-wide reputation is the translation of the Mahábhárata into English. The translation and publication of the 215,000 verses of this vast poem was estimated to cost Rs. 100,000. But the great-hearted man boldly addressed himself to the task, and the monthly parts began to appear. The Indian Government then came to his aid, and undertook to defray the cost of the printing of the national work, and the enterprise also aroused enthusiasm in all countries interested in Sanskrit literature. The name of the energetic scholar became known wherever the Sanskrit language was studied, and his singleness of purpose won for him the cordial co-operation and sympathy of all in India, both officials and non-officials, Europeans and Indians. Protap Chandra Rai fully deserved the honour of the C.I.E. conferred upon him; and he leaves behind him a striking example of perseverance and devotion. In private life he was gentle and courteous, modest and faithful. It is to be regretted that he did not live to see the completion of his last great enterprise, which was rapidly drawing to a close. The institution which he founded—the Dátavya Bhárata Káryyálaya—will, it is to be hoped, finish the work, and do much more in the future to realise the beneficent idea of its great founder.

Readers of India may notice that the list of members of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, which is printed on the cover of this journal, no longer contains the names of Mr. W. C. Bonnerji, Mr. Eardley Norton, and Mr. J. Adam. It may be as well to explain that residents in India who, on visiting London, are elected members of the British Committee cease, by the terms of their election, to be members on their return to India. Thus Mr. Bonnerji and Mr. Eardley Norton ceased to be members of the British Committee fourteen months ago, and it was only through an oversight that their names remained nevertheless upon the list of members. Mr. Adam returned to India last month. In the same connection I may note that Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., who has won golden opinions both in India and in London by his discharge of the duties of President of the Tenth Congress, and Mr. Seymour Keay, M.P., whose knowledge of Indian finance will stand the Committee in good stead, have been elected members of the British Committee during the past month.

Fidus.

THE WAR IN WAZIRISTAN.

An impression seems to have been created that the present war in Waziristan was undertaken to punish the Mahsud Waziris, and other Afghan tribes dwelling on the Western slope of the Suliman range, for incursions and raids committed on our Indian territory. Nothing, however, has occurred to justify such an impression, the raids mentioned in telegrams in the *Times* and other papers being attacks made, not on our territory, but on the military posts which we established in the country of those tribes for the avowed purpose of compelling them to submit to our rule. At the Kabul Conference in November, 1893, Abdur Rahman accepted our proposal that British and Afghan Commissioners should meet with the view of agreeing upon, and marking out, the South-eastern boundary of his kingdom, and he promised at the same time that he would not interfere with any steps we might take for extending our rule over the tract comprised between the boundary line to be agreed upon and the frontier of our Indian Empire. The inhabitants of the tract in question refuse, however, to accept our dominion, and the British force which is now ravaging their country is charged with the task of compelling their submission. Waziristan is only a part of the Afghan borderland which the British Government decided to subjugate. The early possession of this part is desired for the construction of a railway to connect Dehra-Ismail-Khan with Pishin, as an alternative line to the Scind-Pishin railway which is subject to interruptions from floods and landslips, whereby Quetta is cut off, from time to time, from railway communication with India. The subjugation of the borderland was decided upon in 1876, simultaneously with the inauguration of the "Forward" or "Scientific frontier" policy of the Beaconsfield-Salisbury Cabinet, and, on the fall of that Ministry, caused by the disastrous results of the war undertaken in pursuance of that policy, the frontier expeditions were somewhat reduced in scale until 1885, when the return of the former party to power was followed by a sudden and great increase in the military expenditure in India, and by renewed activity in the war against the border-tribes. A simple explanatory list of the expeditions employed will afford an adequate idea of the heavy drain which that war laid on the resources of India, and may alone fully account for the present difficulties of the Indian Exchequer. At the same time, it is sad to contemplate that the chief result of all the blood and treasure that have been expended during the last eighteen years has been to show to the world how an unwise Administration undertook a task beyond its strength in pursuance of a policy as repugnant to morality and justice as it is inconsistent with sound principles of statesmanship. Accordingly every one of the expeditions enumerated below failed in its object, and, among the numerous tribes attacked by us, not one has been brought under British rule.

List of Border Expeditions on the Afghan Frontier, 1877–95.

1877. An expedition was sent against the Jowakis (a section of the Adam Khel Afridis) with orders to "occupy their territory until they tendered their absolute submission." *Government Proclamation*, November 5, 1877.

1878. A column under Major Cavagnari made a night attack upon the Othman Khel villages.

1879. Forces were sent against the Zamushts and a portion of the Orakzai tribe.

1880. Expeditions marched against the Momands and the Mahsud Waziris.

1881. An attack was made on the Kabul Khel Waziris.

1882. A large force under General Wilkinson invaded the territory of the Bozdars.

1882-3. The country of the Shiranis was invaded on the pretence of our desiring to survey the Takt-i-Suliman mountain.

1884-5. Expeditions were sent north against the Chikarzais, Akazais, and Pariari Syads, and in Southern Afghanistan against the Kaker Khel and the Musa Khel.

1885-6. Operations were resumed against the Akazais, and an expedition marched against the Bunerwals.

1886-7. Operations were resumed against the Shiranis and also against the Bozdars.

1888. A column under Major Battye and Captain Urmston invaded the Black Mountain country, but had to retire the same day, both officers having been killed in the first skirmish.

A column was sent to survey the Gomal Pass leading into Waziristan, but was opposed by tribesmen from Makin.

An army of upwards of 8,000 troops, accompanied by the usual number of camp-followers and 5,000 transport mules, again invaded the Black Mountain country, and reported, on its return that the Hasanzais, Akazais, and other tribes had tendered their submission, and consented to our constructing military roads through their country.

1889. A considerable force, accompanied by the late Sir Robert Sandeman, advanced from Baluchistan towards the Zhob valley, but was arrested by the Kidarais.

1890. Sir R. Sandeman, having entered into negotiations with certain chiefs in the Zhob valley and arranged for subsidies to be paid to them, was allowed to establish a military post at Apozai. Similar means procured promises from the Mahsud Waziris, the Shiranis, and the Derwesh Khel of Wana, that the Gomal Pass would be kept open to trade with India.

1891. The submission of the Black Mountain tribes, reported in 1888, proved entirely delusive, and an expedition was sent to subjugate the country and capture the tribal chief, Hasan Ali.

An expedition entered the Miranzai country on the 26th January, to effect its subjugation and to capture the chieftain, Macmudin. Frost-bite and pneumonia attacked our troops, and after two days a party of sick had to be escorted back to Kohat, which delayed operations until the 4th February. The march over the Zara Pass, though covering a distance of only five miles, occupied the main body eighteen hours, the rear-guard and commissariat stores arriving eight hours later. The troops met with no opposition from the enemy, but suffered intensely from exposure; they returned on the 1st March, after destroying and burning many villages, and leaving a British garrison at Gwada.

1891. Our garrison at Gwada was attacked and overpowered on the 4th April, when they beat a precipitate retreat, pursued by the tribesmen as far as the low hills near our frontier. A British force composed of three columns was then sent into the Miranzai country to resume the work of subjugation. The heat was excessive and water very scarce; "many of our men had been without it for twenty-four hours and were exhausted; the young soldiers of the King's

Royal Rifles, fresh to the country, suffered specially from heat and thirst." *Sir W. Lockhart's Despatch*, 8th June.

1892. Our post at Apozai, established in 1890, had ever since suffered from the hostility of the neighbouring tribes, who resented the presence of our troops, by night-firing into the British Agent's camp, cutting off our soldiers within a few hundred yards of their lines, attacking our convoys and detached parties, and harassing our communications with India. Ascribing these hostilities to the influence of an officer of the Amir, who was stationed among the Waziris, we threatened to send a punitive expedition into the country unless that officer was withdrawn; and the Amir complied at once with our request. But he suggested at the same time that an understanding should be arrived at, as to the limit of our Indian Empire. This suggestion evidently hinted that we had trespassed upon tribal territory or we should not have been exposed to the annoyances we complained of. Our reply, published in a leading article of the *Times* of November 3rd, was that "the British Government would not be lightly turned from its settled policy, and that, unless the Amir fell in with that policy, Afghanistan as a kingdom would disappear." This threat remained unnoticed by the Amir, and no action was taken by us to carry it into effect.

1893. The Waziris, having continued their attacks, we threatened them once more with a punitive expedition, but eventually arranged for a conference with Abdur Rahman, at Kabul, at which a secret agreement was concluded, stipulating, *inter alia*, for the terms mentioned at the commencement of this article. Meanwhile the Waziris persisted in their attacks, even while the conference was sitting at Kabul.

1894. The tribal hostility in Waziristan being unabated, a British force entered the country in the last days of October, and was so severely attacked on the 3rd November at Wano that it was disabled from advancing further during the remainder of the year.

1895. Early in January of the current year, three British columns marched on the principal villages in Waziristan, which they destroyed and burnt, driving away some thousand heads of goats and oxen, and leaving the inhabitants, who had fled, to perish of cold and hunger. Such deeds, resorted to for subjugating neighbouring nations from whom we have nothing to fear, reflect no honour on the nation perpetrating them; and they may be condemned also as violating both international law and sound principles of statesmanship; seeing that the animosity and distrust which they engender must long militate against the conclusion of treaties of peace and amity, which are the legitimate and most powerful means of promoting the prosperity of nations.

Barbarities committed in the heat of battle have sometimes been condoned, when followed by brilliant military success. But these conditions are wanting in the present instance, and it seems a matter for wonder as well as for sorrow and anxiety, that the British people should remain indifferent in view of the inglorious wars which are carried on in their name against weak and unoffending nations, who not unnaturally resist the yoke that we are striving to place on their necks. A very ugly feature in our operations against the Afghan frontier tribes is the distribution of money among their chiefs and headmen, in the expectation that the influence of these leaders will be used for inducing the people to acquiesce in our dominion. The *Pioneer* of November 29th last, referring to the tribal attack made on our camp at Wano on the 3rd of that month, said: "We had a number of friendly *maliks* (tribal chiefs) "with us, who had repeatedly undertaken to win "over the malcontents, and as they had completely "failed, the prospect of negotiations being carried "to a successful issue did not seem a bright one. ". . . . The *maliks* were not unanimous in supporting us; some actually joined in the attack. The "enemy had a good idea of the camp, and how "everything was situated; for some of the looters "went straight for the treasure. The money the "enemy divided amongst themselves the next day "at Khaisara." (*Id.*, Nov. 25 - Dec. 2.) "Probably "no more lamentable failure in negotiations with "*jirgahs* has ever been witnessed on the North-"West frontier, than in this instance of Waziristan." (*Id.*, 28th December.) These attempts at conquest through bribery and corruption would appear simply absurd were they not calculated to lower our prestige in the eyes of the Afghans and of our own fellow-subjects in India. They betray on the part of the Indian Administration a sense of irresponsibility and disregard of consequences which is alarming in view of the dearly paid lessons which were taught us by our previous dealings with the same neighbours. The utter worthlessness of bribed agency, such as we are employing in Waziristan, was clearly demonstrated in the war of 1878-80, when chieftains liberally subsidised by us betrayed us at most critical times. For instance, Mr. Howard Hensman, writing from Sir Frederick Roberts's camp on the 26th April, 1880, said: "It seems a pity that a scoundrel "like Padshah Khan cannot meet with his deserts. "He was forgiven for fighting against us in "December; and he now collects his men and "attacks our troops, as if he never had received any "subsidy from us." The annals of that war are full of incidents of the same kind, and Mr. Hensman in his letter of December 24, 1879, the day on which the British army under Sir Frederick Roberts was released from its confinement in Sherpur, wrote: "Our humiliation is so great that to risk a repetition "of it would be ruinous. If we are to hold Kabul, "we must hold it with our bayonets, and not with "our rupees." It seems unaccountable, therefore, that an expedient so doubtful in itself, so un-English and proved to be so useless, should still be resorted to by the Government of India.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE VEDAS.

MR. MAURICE PHILLIPS, the writer of a volume on "The Teachings of the Vedas" (Longmans, Green, and Co.), has drawn most of his statements from the original text and from some of the best authorities who treat of their contents. He has also, as he informs us in the preface, consulted learned Hindus. By these means he is enabled to correct or modify views and interpretations which have been advanced by earlier writers of no mean standing. His account of the acts and attributes of the Vedic gods, of Vedic cosmology, anthropology, and soteriology—to each of which subjects he gives a section—is more full and connected than that given by any of the chief English writers. The divisions which deal with cosmology, anthropology, and soteriology are especially valuable. The section on anthropology enters into details of the Vedic conception of sin, enumerates acts deemed wrong and acts deemed innocent, and considers a question too little discussed—the Vedic belief in immortality. The section on sacrifice does not sufficiently recognise the magic potency imputed to the ceremonial formulae in the age to which the Yajur-veda gives such striking testimony. The very strong additional proof offered by Schröder in his chapters on the Yajur-veda to show the deterioration of religion is not mentioned by Mr. Phillips, though apposite to one of his main arguments. The whole contrast between the Rig-veda, and the Yajur-veda, as pointed by Schröder, would have excellently served the author's purpose. A reference to Mr. Robertson Smith's article on "Sacrifice" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica" would probably, also, have suggested other points of view than those to which he has confined himself. His synthesis of cosmology has the merit of clearly displaying the contradictory character of theories which have been too much overshadowed in English works by the more logical philosophies of a later time. In calling the "Physical Gods" the gods "of Poetry," and the "Metaphysical Gods," the gods "of Philosophy," Mr. Phillips uses language which is, at least, ambiguous, for as he himself shows, "the existence of "one self-existent Being is boldly asserted" in the Rig-veda itself, not to mention the Upanishads; and in writing of the "Physical Gods," he does not sufficiently utilise the light thrown by the passage in the very first book of the Rig-veda, "They speak of "Mitra, Varuna, Agni; that which is and is one "the poets call in various ways." As a matter of balance, too, more should have been said of the profundity of some of the teachings of the Upanishads, which, though it is acknowledged by the use of a quotation, occupies a by no means adequate position in the volume. A philosophy which has analogues in the theories of Aristotle and Kant, and which so late a writer as Royce uses to determine present problems, deserved more attention.

The author is sometimes confident where other students, of the first rank, offer other solutions or refuse to pronounce an opinion. Oldenberg labours to prove that the Asvins are the morning and evening star. Schröder rejects the view, and declares the matter uncertain. Mr. Max Muller thinks they represent Day and Night. Sir Monier Williams suggests another interpretation, but Mr. Phillips, without a sign of doubt, simply makes the assertion that they are rays of the dawn. While he seems to have no hesitation in announcing that Aditi was "the unbounded, infinite expanse," Oldenberg, in probably the very last publication on these subjects which bears his name (Die Religion des Veda, 1894), expresses emphatic dissent from that theory and advances one which, at any rate, does not fall below it in depth and grandeur. Even that *Vishnu* once meant the Sun, is not, by all leading authorities, regarded as beyond doubt, though Mr. Phillips does not make us aware that there is any difference on the subject.

Two parts must be distinguished in this work, viz., the facts supplied from the Vedas and other sources, and the author's reasonings about them. These latter are sometimes difficult to reconcile. On one page he says that the Vedic personification of a natural object as an object of worship "implies "the possession of the concept, more or less clear, "of what *we* denominate God." For "personifica-"tion implies the knowledge of a person," and shows that the Vedic Aryans were "conscious of relation-"ship to something higher than nature." On another page he says they were "ignorant of God as a "definite Being, separate from natural phenomena." Again, he says that though they were thus ignorant, "they possessed a remarkably accurate knowledge of "the actions and attributes which pre-eminently "belong" to God. Attributes imply a being to whom they belong, who is known through them, and are not actions manifestations of an agent? Through what but actions and attributes can anything be learnt about a being at all? The fact that supernatural attributes were "applied indiscrimin-"ately to all the gods" of the Vedic "Pantheon" receives a different light from that which Mr. Phillips gives it, if one remembers Mr. Max Muller's contention—"the old poets never doubted there was "something real of which Agni, Indra and Varuna, "and all the rest were but names; and that that "something was one and one only." All this, however, leaves untouched what we conceive to be a quite obvious fact, that, to a student of the deeper subjects of religion, this work is the most useful manual of the Vedas in the English language.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

In the division on Sir H. James's motion for adjournment on February 21st, the minority who condemned the import duty on cotton goods consisted of 101 Conservatives, 6 Liberal Unionists, and 4 Liberals—total 111. The majority consisted of 51 Conservatives, 14 Liberal Unionists, 46 Nationalists, 1 Parnellite, and 194 Liberals—total, 306. It will be seen that the Conservatives voted two to one against the Government. Among those who voted against the Government were:—Sir E. Ashmead-Bartlett, Mr. Chaplin, Sir Edward Clarke, Lord Cranborne, Sir Richard Temple Sir W. Hart-Dyke, Mr. Akers Douglas, Sir W. Walrond, Lord George Hamilton, and Mr. David Plunket. The most important Tories who supported the Government were Mr. Goschen and Mr. Jackson.

The Liberal Unionists of the Birmingham wing were conspicuous by their absence. Of those who voted, six were against the Government and fourteen for it. The five who followed Sir Henry James were Mr. Hamar Bass, Mr. Victor Cavendish, Sir T. Lea, Sir H. Meysey-Thompson, and Mr. T. W. Russell. Mr. Courtney was among those who voted on the other side. The Irish Nationalists voted without exception for the Government. The Parnellites abstained, with the exception of Mr. Maguire, who supported the Government. The number of Liberal malcontents was only four—namely, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Leese, Mr. Maden, and Mr. Philip Stanhope.

Taking the fifty-seven members who sit for Lancashire constituencies, we find that twenty-three voted against the Government, and thirteen for the Government. These thirteen were all Liberals—namely, Mr. Jacob Bright, Mr. Holland, Mr. Leigh, Mr. Leake, Mr. Mather, Mr. Nevill, Sir H. Roscoe, Mr. Roby, Mr. Snape, Mr. Schwann, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Woods, and Mr. Wright. The Liberals who were absent (including those who were paired on one side or the other) were Mr. J. Williamson, Mr. Smith, Sir U. Kay-Shuttleworth, Mr. C. P. Huntington, Mr. T. B. Potter, Mr. Holland, Mr. Cheetham, and Sir J. Hibbert.

Members flocking out into the lobby upon the conclusion of Mr. Fowler's speech were unusually enthusiastic in their appreciation of its weighty merits. The general opinion was put in a sentence by a Conservative member, intimately connected with the Lancashire cotton trade, who said: "The speech has knocked the bottom out of the business."

The Parliamentary representative of the *St. James's Gazette* said that Mr. Fowler's speech was one of the best things, perhaps the best thing, he has done in the House of Commons. "The main arguments by which the conduct of the Government is to be defended are already sufficiently familiar; but they were put by Mr. Fowler with a clearness and precision which alone, from the point of view of the Government, would have justified the debate. No one watching the House of Commons while the speech was being delivered could fail to see that the purely argumentative part of Mr. Fowler's reply was seriously shaking the confidence of his critics. But the part of the speech which most affected the general body of the House was when the technicalities and the minutiæ of the subject were abandoned for a broad view of the whole problem as it affects the relations of India and England. From his armoury of notes Mr. Fowler produced three or four passages from speeches delivered in the House of Lords last summer by Lord Lansdowne, Lord Roberts, and Lord Cross. With a sense of real responsibility the House of Commons listened in absolute silence to these grave warnings of men who have been more directly responsible for the government of India."

Writing after the division, the *Times* (Feb. 22nd) said:—"The rejection of Sir Henry James's motion for the adjournment of the House of Commons last night saved the Government from a defeat which would have compelled them either to resign or dissolve, but in our opinion it saved the Unionists from a far more serious calamity. We rejoice that the majority of 304 against 109 was so large and decisive as to deprive the division of the character of a party vote. We regret that Mr. Balfour is suffering from indisposition which confines him to his room, but his absence from the debate was not to be regretted; and if some of his colleagues had been also compelled to absent themselves, it would have been an advantage to them and to their party. . . . . But an impression prevailed that the bulk both of the Conservatives and of the Liberal Unionists were prepared to support the motion for adjournment. If they had been successful in doing so, what would have happened? They would have come into office, before or after a General Election, pledged to support the repeal of the Indian cotton duties and, by some means or other, to fill up the deficit left by the withdrawal of that source of revenue. As the great majority of those who have been prominent in demanding the change are in favour of bimetallism, the success of the motion would not only have pledged the Opposition to views inconsistent with the Imperialist principles on which alone we can continue to govern India with honour and safety, but would have cast grave doubts on their fidelity as a party to sound economical doctrines."

The danger which threatened the Government may be judged from the following passage written by the Parliamentary representative of the *Daily Chronicle* on February 21st: "It is quite possible—and I give not my own calculation but that of Ministers—that the Government will be beaten if a division be taken on Sir Henry James's motion for adjourning the House this afternoon in order to call attention to the Indian import duty of 5 per cent. on English cotton goods. I must say, after careful deliberation, that if matters stand as they stood at the adjournment of the House yesterday afternoon, the Government may well be defeated. Sir Henry James's motion has long been an overhanging and a heavy cloud. Now it has seemed no bigger than a man's hand, and now again it looms near and black with peril. I think it is fair to say that this worsened prospect, so far as the Government are concerned, arises from from a serious and a strange modification of Conservative policy. There can be no doubt whatever that in the earlier stages of this question Mr. Arthur Balfour was not inclined to press the Government too hard, or to put his private interests as a Lancashire member against his duty as the leader of a great party, and a probable Prime Minister, and against the possible bankruptcy of India. Since then, and I desire to speak with every reserve, the situation has changed. Mr. Balfour—who at first was disinclined even to challenge a division on the question—has it is said been influenced by Mr. Chamberlain's forcing policy, which has been conspicuous all through the debate on the Address, and is hardening on a decision to throw the Government out on any issue and by any combination that offers."

The *Daily Chronicle* wrote on the day following the division:—The Unionist party unquestionably hoped to overturn the Government on the Indian cotton duties. Finding that it had no moral or numerical force behind it, it retreated in undignified haste from the position into which Mr. Chamberlain's haste and Mr. Balfour's weakness had all but driven it. The issue should be an encouragement to the Government. The Unionist party is undergoing a serious process of demoralisation. In one division it allies itself (always in the interests of the Union and the Empire) with a body of Irish extremists. The next day it is willing to risk the bankruptcy of India in order to curry favour with the cotton spinners of Lancashire. From this position, Mr. Goschen, in Mr. Balfour's unfortunate absence, was obliged to retreat, horse, foot, and artillery. The so-called "Separatist" party was able to put in an unanswerable plea for the common interest, and to demonstrate that in the main it stood both for the honour and for the safety of the Empire. For the moment its hold on the country is greatly strengthened. It has been able to show either that the Opposition has no policy, or that where it ventures on a departure of its own, it works in the direction of unpatriotic intrigue. We recommend it to drive that consideration home to the mind of the people, and to improve its triumph of yesterday at the expense of the party which would disintegrate India, divide London, and alienate Ireland—all in the sacred cause of the unity of the Empire.

Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., has given notice that he will call the attention of the House of Commons to the administration of Civil and Criminal justice in India, and will move a resolution.

Mr. Seymour Keay, M.P., has given notice of motion as follows:—"That, in the opinion of this House, no reference to a Select Committee or Royal Commission on Indian affairs will be satisfactory which excludes inquiry into the economic condition of the people of India and their ability to bear their existing financial burdens."

MR. FOWLER'S OPTIMISM.

SIR AUCKLAND COLVIN'S REPLY.

The following letter from Sir Auckland Colvin has appeared in the *Times*, in reply to the speech delivered by Mr. Fowler at the dinner of the Northbrook Society on January 29th, and discussed in "Indiana":—

Mr. Fowler deprecates what he terms pessimistic views on Indian finance, on the grounds, first, that the assets of India are only 35¾ millions less than its liabilities; secondly, that in the last 14 years there have been 11 years of surplus, and only 3 of deficit, the surplus having amounted to 24, the deficit to 3 millions; thirdly, that the credit of India has enabled it recently to convert 95 millions of debt from a 4 per cent. to a 3½ per cent. stock. To speak, therefore, of bankruptcy in connection with India is "absurd" and "untrue." "I understand," adds Mr. Fowler, "a bankrupt to be a man who cannot pay his debts, whose liabilities exceed his assets, or he is living beyond his income, and that in a very short time the end will come."

As to the assets of India, it may be noted that, though their rupee value is rising, the gold value of her liabilities is also increasing rapidly. But stock-taking is not the only or the best means of testing financial stability. The problem is not how to face liquidation, but how to avoid it. If India can balance revenue and expenditure; if the burden of taxation is not progressive; if taxation is not in danger of bocoming excessive; if there is a further safe margin of taxation to meet unavoidable claims, India is amply solvent. Otherwise, while the balance of her liabilities is progressing, her means of meeting them are approaching exhaustion. How does such a situation usually end in the long run?

At the risk of being written down a pessimist; let me review briefly each of the above postulates.

"There has been a surplus in 11 of the 14 years from 1881." Is this so? Do the accounts show this? But we have to deal with the present and the future, not with the distant past. It may be contended that past experience throws light on future prospects. Very good; but, in that case, if we are to compare like with like (and any other mode of comparison is misleading), comparison must be limited to the last decade. The present dual policy—the policy, that is to say, of a vigorous development of internal resources simultaneously with an energetic military administration—dates from 1885. That is the only possible starting point of comparison. What does it show? Unless I am mistaken, we find that since 1885 there have been four years of deficit; that, in the current year, deficit is again apprehended; that in one year there has been bare equilibrium; surplus in four years only. This, again, was mainly due to a momentary rise in exchange and to temporary causes.

Note, too, that the last surplus dates four years back, in 1891-92. Note, further, that surplus, such as it was, during the last decade was not due to normal growth of revenues. In the hope of regaining equilibrium more than four millions of fresh taxation have been imposed since 1885. Another million has been diverted from the Famine Insurance grant to current needs. Nearly half a million has been taken from the balances at the credit of provincial administrations, which find themselves now without funds for any further material improvement.

As to the remaining postulates, it is not necessary to remind your readers that taxation has been progressive in the last decade. All who are acquainted with the Indian finance know that the burden of taxation is in danger of becoming excessive, and that the further margin of resource to which taxation can be applied is incredibly small, both in itself and from pressure of political considerations.

To return to Mr. Fowler's three tests. If Indian assets at present do not fall greatly short of Indian liabilities, it is certain that she is living beyond her income. But does she pay her debts? What of her gold liabilities? Has not the Secretary of State borrowed largely in 1893 and 1894 in England to meet his gold engagements? Does anyone suppose these loans will prove temporary only—mere accommodation loans? Can the gold liabilities of the coming year be met by the Secretary of State's drawings, or will further loans or kindred expedients be needed? As to the credit of India, it is high for borrowing purposes, because the ultimate responsibility for the administration of India rests on Great Britain. It may be that the investing public attach undue importance to the connexion; but the credit of India will remain high so long as their estimate of the value of such connexion continues whatever may be the state of its finances. "Pessimists" hold that in the crisis through which India is passing it is necessary to reduce expenditure to a *minimum* and to nurse every possible item of receipt. Railways, if not, as Sir Juland Danvers puts it in his letter published in your issue of February 2nd, the sheet anchor of Indian finance, furnish, next to land revenue, the most elastic item among Indian receipts. At a time when taxation is being constantly added to, the railway account in the Budget, in consequence of constant construction of new lines some of which are unproductive, adds nearly two million to the deficit. No one, doubts the stimulus given to trade and industry by railway construction. No one on the other hand, can fail to see that when such construction is accompanied by recurring taxation (by import duties, for example), and when current revenue is diverted from administrative needs to meet or to lessen deficit, trade and industry are liable to be hampered. The same financial difficulties which have unhappily compelled the Indian Government to place an import duty on English piece goods seem to disqualify it at present from continuing to be England's customer for large consignments of railway plant. Not only is capital annually borrowed for extension of railway construction works, but (deficit recurring annually) interest on such capital must be also borrowed. All this time expenditure exceeds income. There is no visible chance of any relief from the pressure of exchange; and the fiscal reserves of the Government are approaching a point when they will no longer be able to furnish much increased supply.

Reviews.

MACMILLAN'S "INDIAN STUDIES."

The Globe Trotter in India Two Hundred Years Ago: and other Indian Studies. By MICHAEL MACMILLAN, B.A. (Oxon.), Fellow of the Bombay University and Professor of English Literature at Elphinstone College, Bombay. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co.)

Nearly the whole of the contents of this charming and suggestive volume have already appeared in various periodical papers published in Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. Professor Macmillan has judged rightly, however, in believing that their republication in a collected form will be welcomed by a far wider public than they are likely to have reached in separation. The papers that give the title to the volume occupy about a quarter of the whole number of pages, and the original essays which complete the work are full of most interesting matter, treated with ample knowledge and with the lucidity that comes of mastery of the subjects.

The globe-trotter resuscitated by Professor Macmillan is Gemelli Careri, an Italian doctor in civil law with vagabond blood in his veins. Impelled by a keen curiosity, Careri started on his journey round the world in June, 1693, and reached home again in December, 1699. He had already exhausted Europe in 1683, and during his six years' wanderings in the East he visited Egypt, the Holy Land, Turkey in Europe and in Asia, Persia, India, and China. Professor Macmillan, however, is mainly concerned with Careri's experiences in India. He has followed the translation in "Churchill's Voyages," expressing in his own language the substance of the story, and occasionally condensing Careri's diary. At the same time he intersperses comments of his own. Altogether he gives an admirable presentation of the more salient points of Careri's narrative, and brings out very effectively the main elements of contrast with the conditions of the present day. The extraordinary passage that Careri made between Bander Congo and Damaun in a Moorish ship illustrates the dangers to travellers from the egregious ignorance and cowardice of the officers and crew. The pilot had come at a venture, having been simply a tobacconist at Congo; and the captain, though capable of convicting the pilot of inexperience, was anxious, in moments of difficulty, to resign his duties to the intelligence of Careri. With their united seamanship they made their voyage about twice as long as it ought to have been, to say nothing of the multiplication of dangers. At Careri's visit, Surat was still the principal port of India, "all nations in the world trading thither, no ship sailing the Indian Ocean but what puts in there to buy, sell, or load." It is a pity that Careri did not leave behind him a detailed description of the city; but he stayed only a few days. There is especial interest in Careri's expedition from Bassein to the Buddhist caves at Kennery, some twenty miles from Bombay, on the island of Salsetta; in his description of Goa, the metropolis of Portuguese India, then far gone in decline; and in his arduous and adventurous visit to the great Mughal's camp at Galgala.

> "What strikes us most, perhaps, when we attempt by the help of Gemelli's travels to estimate the progress made by the world in the last two hundred years is his great credulity. In this respect there is far less difference between him and Herodotus, who lived more than two thousand years before him, than between him and an ordinary nineteenth century traveller. We have no reason to think that Gemelli was exceptionally credulous for his age. He was an educated man, and as a doctor of civil law must have had some practice in sifting evidence. His frequent criticisms of Tavernier show that he knew well enough that travellers were in danger of being misled by the deceitfulness of their informants or by misunderstanding. Yet he was ready to accept numberless statements that no educated man of the present day would think worthy of a moment's consideration."

The examples cited by Professor Macmillan fully bear out this statement. Still, there is a great deal of interest, as well as of value, in his narrative, and it would be too exacting to require even a doctor of civil law to rise definitively above his age and times.

Professor Macmillan writes a sympathetic and kindly critical notice of "An Anglo-Indian Man of Letters," Mr. Curwen of the *Times of India*, who broke down somewhat suddenly and died in 1892. His comments on Mr. Curwen's contributions to literature, under pressure of journalistic work, if considerate, are yet justly discriminating. The chapters on "Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases" and "Some Indian Proverbs" contain numerous points of great interest to students of language and of society. "From a philological point of view," says Professor Macmillan, "India is now in a position similar to that of England immediately after the Norman Conquest, and to her own former position at the period of her history when Muhammadan invaders introduced Persian and Arabic into the country."

> "The philological results of the British Empire in India may be briefly summed up as follows: firstly, that many Indian words have been introduced into the English language; secondly, that many English words have been introduced into the vernaculars of India; and thirdly, that several English words and several Indian words have assumed new senses and new combinations, owing to the social intercourse between Englishmen and natives of India."

The interest lies in the full and judicious illustration of the operation of processes. The comparison of English and Indian proverbs is extremely well presented. Professor Macmillan is under no illusion as to how far these proverbs illustrate the real qualities of the masses of the peoples. As to the Indian proverbs, he denies them any great subtlety or masterly employment of language, but admits "they contain, except in few exceptional cases, a great amount of practical shrewdness expressed in homely words and illustrated by simple examples." The excellent papers on "Indian and Homeric Epics"—the Rámáyana and Mahábhárata compared in selected points with the Iliad and the Odyssey—and the "Morality of the Mahábhárata," while popular in form, will be especially interesting to students of classical poetry and the history of moral ideas. The resemblances between the epics of India and Greece "might possibly be attributed, if no other alternative were possible, partly to similarity of subject, partly to the common origin of the Greeks and Indians, and the consequent similarity of manners and customs that remained until the advance of civilisation and difference of climate and other circumstances had begun to obliterate their original resemblance." But Professor Macmillan thinks it "more natural to account for them by the indirect connection between Indians and Greeks that must have existed in the beginning of the fifth century before Christ." The hints towards the working out of this theory form one extremely interesting feature of the essay on this subject.

There remains the most valuable paper of them all, on "Heredity and the Regeneration of India." Professor Macmillan does not assume, but concludes from a careful and effective marshalling of facts, that "the intellectual and moral character and the physical strength with which a child begins life are entirely, or almost entirely, derived from its parents." He next inquires "whether a child derives more of its original character from its father or its mother, and whether any distinction can be made between the inheritance derived from the two parents;" and he concludes that, on the whole, "mothers and fathers exert an equal influence." He is now in a position to apply the doctrine of heredity to the question of the regeneration of India.

> "Why is it that India, which in the golden ages of Sanskrit literature was in the forefront of the world's civilisation, has been for the last thousand years in a backward condition, while other nations have been progressing rapidly and far outstripping her in the race? Why is it that the nation, that in the past produced poetry and philosophy fit to rival the masterpieces of Greece, has for so many centuries produced no literary work of high rank, no great poet or dramatist, or historian, or philosopher, no great name in literature, no man of first-rate eminence in political life since Akbar—and even he, though an Indian by birth, belonged to a family but newly settled in India? No single cause can account for this strange retrogression, but I am convinced that the consideration of heredity plainly shows that the principal cause has been the practice of female seclusion, which appears to have gradually become more prevalent and stringent rom the date ot the earliest Aryan invasion of India, and come to a climax at the time of the Muhammadan conquest. If you accept the law of heredity—and I think you cannot refuse to accept it—the practice of female seclusion must constantly tend to national deterioration, to diminution of physical, intellectual, and probably also moral strength in each successive generation."

Professor Macmillan simply sketches the broad lines of his argument, but he puts the main points in a very popular and effective manner. It is to be hoped that his suggestions will duly impress the leaders of native thought, and prove fruitful of results. For there is probably no other single idea that is fraught with more important consequences for the India of to-day.

JOHN RUSSELL COLVIN.

Rulers of India: John Russell Colvin, the last Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West under the Company. By Sir Auckland Colvin, K.C.S.I., K.C.M.G., C.I.E. Clarendon Press.

John Russell Colvin was educated at the University of St. Andrew's and at Haileybury College, whence he passed in his nineteenth year to India. He gave evidence of great promise in mathematics and classics and at the College at Fort William, where he passed the first few months of his life in India, he distinguished himself in Persian. In 1826, during his first year of residence, he was appointed Assistant to Mr., afterwards Sir, William Macnaghten, but in less than twelve months was set free from this routine work and sent to Cuttack as Assistant to Sir Henry Ricketts. After another transfer to Haidarabad, he returned to Calcutta in 1830 to take an appointment in the Revenue and Judicial Department with Mr. Macnaghten again as his chief. He rose in the Service, and obtained during this time a wide and most valuable knowledge of Indian affairs. The time was pleasantly spent. Social life at Calcutta then offered exceptional advantages, and Mr. Colvin became one of the accomplished circle which centred in Macaulay. He was a member of the Committee for Public Instruction, and warmly supported Macaulay's views as to the introduction of English education. In 1836 Lord Auckland succeeded Sir William Bentinck as Governor-General, and immediately on his arrival offered the post of Private Secretary to Mr. Colvin. He accepted it, and entered upon duties which, arduous as they could not but be, were destined to become specially important in this case. Organisation is much more complete now than it was then, and every affair has not to pass through the Private Secretary's hands. Continual intercourse with the Home Government has changed the character of the work, and deprived it of some of its responsibility. Mr. Colvin has never been accused of any lack of ardour in the manner in which he discharged his duties. All his energies were placed at Lord Auckland's disposal. But this fact itself has drawn upon him comment of a different kind. "The very excess of the Private Secretary's pleasure at his master's triumphs, the depth of his distress at his master's humiliation, were regarded in some quarters as presumption amounting to proof that the measures with which he so warmly identified himself must have been of his own inspiring." Lord Auckland's career in India is made memorable by the disastrous war in Afghanistan, and Sir John Kaye has not hesitated to say, nor others to repeat, that the war was mainly due to the influence of Macnaghten, Torrens, and Colvin. Affairs on the North-West

Frontier were in an unsettled condition when Lord Auckland reached India; Sir William Bentinck had left behind him a Minute calling the attention of his successor to the facts of the case. The Government decided to adopt as pacific a course as possible and Lord Auckland came to India with the avowed intention of interesting himself in matters of domestic legislation. The incidents which led up to the unfortunate and calamitous change of policy are detailed at some length, and by means of extracts from the despatches sent and received by Lord Auckland the author endeavours to clear his father from Sir John Kaye's imputations. The character of the Governor-General appears in another light than that of a man easily led by his subordinates to adopt a line of action disapproved by the members of his Council. It is urged that the despatch from the Secret Committee, which crossed Lord Auckland's despatch bearing the news of the declaration of war with Afghanistan, exonerates him from having acted in opposition to the Government, and that this was persistently ignored by Sir John Kaye at a time when he must have had access to so important a document. In 1842 Lord Auckland was recalled, and Colvin accompanied him on furlough to England, where he remained till 1845. On returning to India Colvin assumed charge of the Nepal Residency, was afterwards ordered to Maulmain, and remained there till 1848, when he went to Calcutta as a Judge of the Company's Chief Court of Appeal. In the two last capacities he met with signal success, and spent pleasant and useful years in Calcutta, till in 1853 he was selected by Lord Dalhousie to succeed Mr. Thomason as Governor of the North-West Provinces. This post he held till his death in 1857—an event which was overshadowed by the Mutiny. His conduct during that outbreak has been impugned. He has been accused of acting in too vacillating and conciliatory a manner. His offer of pardon was misconstrued, and the misconstruction has been repeated. The difficulties of his position were great, his resources small, he was cut off from help, and his bodily health was failing. On the 9th of September, shortly before the fall of Delhi, he died. He was associated with two of the most evil days on which British rule in India has fallen. It was well-nigh impossible that a name so conspicuous should pass unsmirched by report, and until now that report has passed almost unchallenged. Undoubtedly his great ability and his spotless integrity entitle him to a high place in that long roll of eminent civilians who served under the East India Company. The present volume, carefully written by Sir Auckland Colvin, brings to a fitting close a valuable and interesting series.

Sir William Wedderburn, M.P. has given notice that he will move in the House of Commons for a Return, prepared by Mr. James Bryce, M.P., showing expenditure incurred out of the revenues of India on the construction of railways and roads, and on military expeditions and explorations, and subsidies to native chiefs beyond the West and North-West frontier of India, from April, 1882, to March, 1891.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

FEBRUARY, 1895.

Arena (Gay and Bird). Gandhi, V. R., "Christian Missions in India as viewed by an Eastern Scholar."

Board of Trade Journal (Eyre and Spottiswoode). "The Foreign Trade of British India."

Calcutta Review (Kegan Paul). Johnston, C., "The Dawn of Indian Research." Dutt, R. C., "Modern Progress in India." Biddulph, C. E., "The Berars." "Bengal: Its Castes and Curses." Hope, C. W., "The Edinburgh Academy in India."

Edinburgh Review (Longmans). "Twelve Years of Indian Government."

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). G. F. S., "Great Women in Eastern History." Pope, Rev. G. U., "Ethics of Modern Hinduism."

New Review (Wm. Heinemann). Keary, C. F., "India: Impressions."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

FEBRUARY, 1895.

Haig, Major-General, M. R., M.R.A.S. .... "The Indus Delta Country." (Kegan Paul.) .... 5s. 0d.

Cowell, E. B. (Editor)............ "The Jataka, or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births." Vol. I. Translated by Robert Chalmers, of Oriel College, Oxford. (Cambridge, University Press) net. .... 12s. 6d.

Colvin, Sir Auckland, K.C.S.I. .... "John Russell Colvin: The Last Lieut-Governor of the North-Western Provinces under the Company." (Henry Frowde) .... 2s. 6d.

Muddock, J. E. .... "The Star of Fortune, Story of the Indian Mutiny." (Chapman and Hall) .... — —

Wilson, Annie C. (A. C. MacLeod)........ "After Five Years in India, or Life and Work in a Punjab District." (Blackie and Son)...... 6s. 0d.

"The India List, Civil and Military, 1895. (W. H. Allen and Co.)........................ 10s. 6d.

Douglas, William .... "The Indian Exchanges, Considerations for Remitters." Paper. (Manchester: Palmer Howe & Co.) — —

Cave-Browne, Rev. John................ "Incidents of Indian Life." Second Edition. (Maidstone: W. P. Dickinson) .... 2s. 6d.

Hallett, Holt S. .... "Lancashire's Case Against the Indian Import Duties." (Blackburn: J. and G. Toulmin) .... — —

Maclean, James Mackenzie............ "A Guide to Bombay." (G. Street and Co.)........ Rs. 5.

"Progress Report of the Archæological Survey of Western India, May, 1893, to April, 1894. (Government of Bombay, General Department) .... Ans. 4.

Burgess, James, C.I.E., LL.D. (Editor) "Epigraphia Indica." A Collection of the Indian Inscriptions of the Archæological Survey. Vol. II. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing) .... Rs. 16.

"The India Office List, 1895." Compiled by direction of the Secretary of State for India. (Harrison and Sons) .... 6s. 0d.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, MARCH, 1895.

THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT IN INDIA.

BY PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

In English views of India, the principal actors on the scene, it may safely be said, are the Government and the National Congress. The Government is always in evidence; and when the National Congress held its annual meeting in the end of December, all eyes turned for the occasion to Madras. Very little attention, comparatively, seems to have been given to the numerous meetings of social bodies in various parts of the country which were being held about the same time. Even the annual meeting of the National Social Conference, though it also assembled at Madras on the 30th of December, was quite overshadowed by the National Congress. Mr. Justice Ranade, of Bombay, addressing the Hindu Social Reform Association two days before, spoke of the National Social Conference as "a humble sister of the National Congress." The seven years' survey of Mr. Ranade's speech, together with the subsequent proceedings of the Social Conference, may, however, fairly suggest a doubt whether that "humble sister" may not, in the long run, prove to be the Cinderella of the family. The mental ferment of modern India may be regarded as issuing in three broad streams—religious, social, and political. At many points, however, these streams run together and mix inseparably. It is inevitable that the quickening of native thought should manifest itself in all these main directions, and that in different minds a superior importance should be attached to one or other mode of manifestation. The middle position of the social movement, implicated, as it must be, with religion especially on the one side, and on the other in a less yet material degree with politics, furnishes it with a vantage ground, from which it must operate with commanding influence. Within that movement, if we mistake not, there have already germinated the strongest seeds of potency and promise in the modern transformation of Indian life and thought.

The Social Conference met with a record of seven years' work behind it. For a summary survey of that work Mr. Justice Ranade's address is of first-rate importance, and deserves the most careful study. Seven years are but a short epoch in the development of a national movement, and critics who look at a single meeting, as well as friends who are inconsiderately enthusiastic, are apt to take up depressing views of the progress of the cause. Mr. Justice Ranade, however, displayed a truer insight and judgment, and his address ought to prove highly encouraging. The fact is that Mr. Ranade is in the very centre, if not the head centre himself, of the social movement; and, therefore, it is not without an ample basis of facts that he bids his friends be of good courage. Thus, he first points to the Native States. "If the heart of the nation can be traced anywhere in its ancient strongholds," he says truly, "you will certainly seek it, strongly entrenched, in the Native States. If any movement stirs the Native States, which are impervious to your political and industrial propaganda, that is a sign that the heart of the nation has been touched." Mr. Ranade, then, is able to point to seventeen States in Rajputana as members of the Walter Krita Sabha, "whose annual reports show how strong is the organisation that has been set up in that province for the curtailment of extravagant expenditure on marriages and funerals and the regulation of child-marriages, not only among the Rajputs, but among many other castes allied to and subordinate to them." He points also to the work of social elevation promoted by the rulers of Baroda, Kashmir, and Cambay, and to the remarkable measures recently passed by the late Máhárája of Mysore in consultation with his Parliament. "The genuineness of the feeling," Mr. Ranade rightly judges, "is borne witness to by the fact that in inaugurating the new social regulations different methods of procedure have been adopted by different States to accomplish the same end. The method of direct legislation has found favour with Mysore, of caste initiation in Baroda, and of executive regulations in Rajputana." These are undoubtedly powerful indications of the spontaneous and indigenous origin of the movement. The interference of the British Government is a matter of extreme delicacy. It could more safely deal with such gross customs as suttee, infanticide, and hook-swinging; but it received a lesson of caution from the reception of the Age of Consent Act. While, however, its true policy is to leave the native mind to work out its own social reformation, it may often be able indirectly to extend opportune and judicious assistance to the spontaneous native desires for change. This it has happily done in various important cases, such as the new partition law in Bengal, and the Malabar Marriage Bill at Madras. The essential spirit of the movement is also manifested in the fact that "the rulers of Baroda, Indore, Kapurthala, Bhaunagar, Morvi, Gondal, Vadhawan, Kooch Behar, Kohlapur, and many other States, have crossed the seas, and with large retinues, and some with their wives and children." But the movement is fundamentally popular; and this critically significant fact Mr. Ranade illustrated in ample detail.

The outcome of the new spirit in Indian life will be best appreciated from a glance at part of Mr. Justice Ranade's review. Among other points he cites these:

> "The result of all this awakening is best seen in the keener appreciation of the moral law of purity and charity. This constitutes, in my view, the most instructive and hopeful feature of the past ten years. Even the Government has been forced to acknowledge the force of this new feeling. It is at the root of the agitation against vivisection, the Contagious Diseases Act, and the compulsory examination of women, in which last respect the Government here has had to yield to Indian and English public opinion. The same feeling also finds expression in the great Temperance agitation which has led to the appointment of two Commissions of inquiry. The agitation against the abuse of Temple endowments may be traced to the same source. The agitation against the nautch girl and loose habits of family life is explained by reform on the same principle. The movements intended to help the Pariah classes are due to the same potent cause. The miserable condition of the child-widow is now more keenly recognised as a problem which must be solved. Widows' homes are springing up in Allâhâbad, Calcutta, and Poona, and the question of the re-marriage of child-widows has passed the preliminary stage of a trial experiment. Polygamy and the sale of girls in marriage are also slowly disappearing from the land, though they will, I fear, fight hard to the end. More than seventy-five re-marriages have taken place in our Presidency, and twenty-five similar marriages during the last twenty years, and the cause has shown a steady rule of slow progress all over the country."

Measured, not by the standard of Western races, but by the conservative strength of Indian prejudices, and by the progress observable in Indian politics and Indian industries, the social advance of the past seven years is, beyond cavil, a very remarkable phenomenon. Its real significance lies in its inevitable future. It is an easy matter to sneer at the comparatively small muster of members at Madras, and to make a great deal of the occasionally discordant elements of opinion expressed there. But when one looks at the essential points of agreement, and remembers that simultaneous meetings with like purposes were being held in many other parts of the country, one finds material reasons to pause, and consider where this new spirit is likely to lead. Gradually the bonds of hereditary prejudice are being relaxed, and as they are relaxed the freer will India be to put her whole strength into the work of regeneration in every department of speculative and active life. The resolutions of the Social Conference dealt in a liberal spirit with many questions of far-reaching moment: the raising of the marriage age; the discouragement of nautch girl exhibitions (with arguments from the Argyll Rooms and the Empire Promenade); the placing of the enforcement of decrees for the restitution of conjugal rights in the discretion of the judges; the encouragement of the re-admission of foreign-travelled men into society; the extension of the practice of re-marriage, and the prevention of personal disfigurement of child-widows under certain caste rules; the promotion of temperance; the mitigation of racial dissensions on account of disputed customs and practices; the requirement of private morality in public men; the advancement of the higher education of women; and the proper administration of temple endowments. Not one of these objects but must be acknowledged to be highly laudable. The root difficulty, however, is the terrible ordeal of individual action in conformity with the principles of the social reformers. There is no ordeal in England to compare with it, and it is only men of exceptional strength of mind that can be expected to endure the social obloquy, and the wrenching of family and personal ties, that are supposed to be knotted with religious sanctions. The marvel is, not that the movement has made slow propress, but that it has ever achieved a real commencement. We in England honour and reverence the heroic men that sacrificed their all and their very lives in maintaining the cause of freedom of conscience. No less honour and reverence, as well as sympathy, our own history ought to teach us, is due to the heroic men that are now leading their less enlightened countrymen in India to burst the cruel bonds of enslaving and degrading customs.

A. F. Murison.

THE EXERCISE OF ARBITRARY POWER IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INDIA.

By J. Dacosta.

"*Le gouvernement le plus parfait est celui où le pouvoir est le moins arbitraire.*"—Voltaire.

"*L'exécution de mauvaises lois est moins dangereuse que l'arbitraire. L'usage de l'arbitraire augmente sans relâche le besoin de l'arbitraire.*"—Lemontey.

The exercise of arbitrary power in the administration of India has increased of late years to a dangerous extent, sowing the seed of corruption and dissolution in every part of the governing body. The finances of the country are disorganised. The administration of justice is debased, tribunals controlled by the Executive being made to condone and sanction the illegal practices of fiscal officers. The Legislature, stripped of its highest attributes, and made to subserve the illegal purposes of the Government, has become degraded in the eyes of its own members, as well as in those of the people. The police, charged with executing the arbitrary behests of the authorities, are, by a constant extension of the sphere of their operations, afforded increased facilities for corrupt practices and extortion; and the army, which is kept on a war footing in time of peace, has, for eighteen years, been employed in inglorious and unjustifiable wars resulting in failure and humiliation.

That the above is a faithful outline of the state of things prevailing in India, there is no longer any room to doubt. The Indian Government is paying its way with borrowed money, and its only resource for staving off bankruptcy for a time appears to be a British guarantee for its loans—a guarantee which is to be asked for with the threat that its refusal would cause the dissolution of the Empire. Such, at all events, is the financial situation indicated in the following statement of a semi-official organ published subsequently to the promulgation of the last Indian Budget, and the condition of the Indian Exchequer has nowise improved since then :—

> "The most astonishing fact about the present situation is that the credit of the country for borrowing purposes keeps up as it does. The fact disguises what some writers in England have already recognised as the practical insolvency of India, which has actually set in. We are paying our way at home—as regards, amongst other charges, the interest on money borrowed—by borrowing more: and in view of the ghastly mess that the India Office has contrived to make of our affairs, there seems little prospect of being able to turn back within any reasonable future from the path on which we have thus entered. By degrees it must become perceptible that, no matter how exalted the morality of the Indian Government may be, there may come a time when it will not be able to act up to the principles on which till now its credit has reposed. New difficulties will then be found in placing, on such terms as we have been used to, loans that depend for their security on the resources of the Indian Government. Then will borrowing become possible only with the guarantee of the British Government, or, in other words, when the public at large is no longer willing to lend us funds with which to carry on, the Government of England will have to do that for us, or proclaim the dissolution of the Empire" (*Pioneer*, June 15, 1894).

Then, as regards the administration of justice, the decisions of the District Courts and subordinate tribunals have become a public scandal and a cause of consternation to the people. Private property is forcibly appropriated by the Government, and the District Courts, when appealed to for redress, decide without admissible evidence that the property belongs to the State. This statement would seem incredible, were it not supported by judgments delivered by the High Courts and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the comparatively small number of cases in which the victims had the means of appealing to those independent tribunals. Furthermore, innocent men have been sentenced to fines, whipping, imprisonment, hard labour or death, upon transparently false evidence concocted by the police; and when these nefarious proceedings have been exposed through an appeal to a High Court, the illegal conduct of the judge or officer implicated has been condoned by the Government on the unexplained and unaccountable ground that there is no reason to doubt the honourable motives which actuated the erring judge.

Lastly, as regards the army, there seems no justification in its being kept up on a war footing in time of peace, seeing that no enemy threatens the Indian frontier. The operations now carried on for the subjugation of the Waziris aptly illustrate, by their complete failure, the impracticable policy in the pursuit of which the Indian army is chiefly employed.

While reform is thus urgently needed in every department of the State, it is very powerfully resisted by the Secretary of State for India, who has acquired, through the sacrifice of Indian interests, the support of Parliament—the only constitutional authority to which he is amenable. Under such conditions the prospect of reform must seem very remote. Human affairs, however, are never stationary. In obedience to the laws of evolution, societies, like all organic bodies, are incessantly undergoing either healthy development and progress or retrogression and decay. To believe that a state of things such as now exists in India can continue without causing a disruption of the bonds which hold society together is simply to ignore the teachings of history. Communities are formed for the protection of life and property, and men willingly give up a portion of their natural rights in return for such protection. The compact implies honest zeal on the part of the rulers, and obedience and co-operation on the part of the people. History records, it is true, many instances in long-established monarchies of temporary misrule being condoned by the feeling of loyalty which previous reigns had engendered in the hearts of the subjects; but whenever reform became hopeless the people have not been slow in resuming their natural rights, and the suddenness of such resumption has often been a matter of general surprise.

James II. ascended, apparently without opposition, the throne of Great Britain in February, 1685. He violated the constitution of the realm, unauthorisedly levied customs, was at war with Parliament in order to obtain money, and demanded supplies to maintain a standing army. Before the expiration of three years James II. was a fugitive and a pensioner of the King of France.

In France events still more analogous to the present circumstances of British India occurred in the reigns of Louis XV. and Louis XVI., and it was after a personal observation of those events that the two eminent writers formed the opinions regarding arbitrary power, which are quoted at the head of this article.

The arbitrary power exercised by Louis XV. led to profligate extravagance, oppressive taxation, and ultimately to the dispersion of the Parliament of Paris, which had refused to register his edicts for more money. The King, on being told of the ruin which threatened the country, replied that "the monarchy would last his time." He died shortly afterwards, and Louis XVI., who sincerely desired to improve the condition of his subjects, and was prepared for great personal sacrifices in the undertaking, unfortunately lacked the mental power of contending with the difficulties in the way. He restored the Parliament of Paris and proposed to abolish the most odious taxes, provided the privileged classes contributed to the revenue in the same proportion as the rest of the nation. This, however, the privileged classes refused to do. Meanwhile England was in the midst of her contest with the American colonies, and a passionate cry was raised in France for war with the English to avenge the loss of Canada. Louis XVI. was averse to that war; but he had to yield to the national movement, and the financial embarrassments of the French Treasury were considerably increased by that war.

A bold and ambitious Minister, Calonne, tried a new policy consisting in spending money on large public works calculated to give a grand idea of the national prosperity and sustain the public credit; but he soon confessed that, so long as the privileged classes did not bear a fair portion of the financial burden, he saw no means to cover the deficit, which then amounted to £7,600,000. His successor, M. Brienne, proposed to borrow £17,000,000 to meet immediate wants, but the Parliament of Paris refused to register the necessary edict, saying that the matter was in the province of the States-General, an elective body through which in previous times the interests of every province were constitutionally represented to the King. That body had, however, not been convoked for many years, because its functions militated with the arbitrary power assumed by the sovereign. Louis XVI. was then ill-advised enough to enforce the registration in the Parliament of Paris of certain edicts creating the *Cour Plénière* and a judicial tribunal, which superseded almost entirely the functions of the Parliament of Paris. The Provincial Parliaments at once manifested their sympathy with the Parliament of the metropolis by suspending their sittings; and public meetings were held in many parts of the kingdom where oaths were taken to oppose the innovations of the Crown. Serious disturbances followed; all classes clamoured for the meeting of the States-General; and the King, feeling the struggle to be hopeless, convoked that body for the month of May, 1789. It was arranged that one half of its members should belong to the privileged classes—the noblesse, the clergy, and the tiers-état—and that the other half should consist of *roturiers*, or non-privileged persons. In all other respects, however, the arrangements were sadly deficient. Scarcely any limit was imposed regarding suffrage, and no provision was made as to the deliberations being separate or collective.

The people were greatly excited; a kind of political millennium was expected from the proposed system of parliamentary or representative government. The elections nevertheless went off quietly; and, at the opening ceremony, the King's speech was listened to with respect. No one at that meeting could have imagined that a great revolution, the abolition of royalty, the dispersion of the privileged classes and wholesale massacres were soon to follow.

The reader will doubtless have observed a remarkable similarity between the events in France, which preceded the convocation of the States-general, and the events in India which followed the introduction, in 1858, of the present system of administration controlled by a member of the British Cabinet. The similarity, however, is quite intelligible, seeing that the causes, which operated in the two countries during the periods referred to, were essentially identical. The financial embarrassments in both countries, brought about by the extravagance of the rulers, had led to oppressive taxation and popular suffering and discontent. (*See Lord Mayo's Budget Speech*, 1870.) In both countries the difficulties of the Exchequer were aggravated by useless wars and inordinate expenditure on public works; and in both countries also the voice of the people was silenced through a resort to arbitrary power by the head of the State. Ultimately in France the evil assumed so acute and threatening a character that, when the empirical remedies applied proved unavailing, the Government resolved to consult the people as to the best way to deal with difficulties which both the people and the Government were deeply interested in surmounting. In India at present the difficulties are likewise increasing, and all the empirical remedies hitherto tried have proved utterly ineffectual. It becomes interesting, therefore, and of practical importance for our guidance in India, to inquire why the popular step taken in France for the solution of her difficulties, failed to arrest the downward course of her affairs. History ascribes the failure to the following causes. The States-general had not previously been a legislative body, and lacked, therefore, the stringent rules which are indispensable for the freedom of deliberation in a popular assembly. Hence the new assembly was unfitted for the performance of the high functions which it was suddenly called to undertake. No principle had even been fixed for apportioning among the three sections of the assembly—the noblesse, the clergy, and the tiers-état—the degree of influence that each was legitimately entitled to exercise over its decisions. Meanwhile the sufferings and irritation of the people and the difficulties and anxieties of the Government were increasing daily; and, in the midst of the disturbances and the angry passions which raged at the time, it became impossible to redeem and remedy the fatal errors and omissions that had been committed in the hurried constitution of the assembly.

The time may come when Parliamentary or representative institutions will be deemed suitable for the administration of India; and considering that no practical suggestion has come from any quarter for affording her the relief which she even now so urgently needs, it can scarcely be deemed premature to discuss how representative institutions, which have proved beneficial in every part of the globe where they have been introduced, could best be adapted to the requirements of our great dependency.

J. Dacosta.

INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

LUNCHEON TO MR. A. WEBB, M.P.

IMPORTANT GATHERING AT THE NATIONAL LIBERAL CLUB.

Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., who recently returned from India, where he presided over the Tenth Indian National Congress at Madras, was entertained at luncheon at the National Liberal Club, on February 18th, "by a few of his friends who are interested in the welfare" of India. The Right Hon. James Stansfeld, M.P., presided, and among the gentlemen present were Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., Mr. George Russell, M.P., Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., Sir W. Lawson, M.P., Mr. John Dillon, M.P., Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., Mr. Seymour Keay, M.P., Mr. P. J. Power, M.P., Mr. W. Crosfield, M.P., Mr. S. Young, M.P., Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien, M.P., Sir J. Leng, M.P., Mr. H. C. F. Luttrell, M.P., Mr. Bodkin, M.P., Mr. J. Wilson, M.P., Mr. Swift McNeil, M.P., Mr. H. Roberts, M.P., Sir W. W. Hunter, Mr. A. E. Fletcher, Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D., Mr. C. Hancock, Mr. A. G. Symonds, Mr. W. Martin Wood, Mr. William Digby, Mr. Parbati C. Roy, Mr. Gordon Hewart, Mr. Kabiruddin Kazi, Mr. A. M. K. Dehlan, Mr. J. V. Desai, Mr. S. J. Meerza, Mr. H. Mullick, Mr. J. M. Nair, Mr. K. A. Ghaswalla, Mr. M. A. Ghain, Mr. Gopal Singh, Mr. H. N. Haridas, Mr. M. H. Nazar, and Mr. Pestonji.

After luncheon,

Mr. Stansfeld said: The first toast I have to propose is that of the Queen of the United Kingdom and the Empress of India. (Cheers.) We can say of our sovereign that she has been the very model of a constitutional sovereign, and I do not believe that history affords an example of a more truly constitutional, a more sympathetic, or a more beloved one than the Queen who sits upon the throne of the United Kingdom. (Cheers.) She is also the Empress of India. I do not lay stress upon that title, but I am glad to believe, and indeed I may say to know, that she is regarded with reverence and affection by the vast native population of our great dependency. (Hear, hear.) They know what her sympathy has always been for those who suffer, for those who are poor, who need help, who need lifting up in the world in which we live; and, if I mistake not, in that great National Congress at Madras over which our friend Mr. Alfred Webb presided there were conclusive evidences of genuine loyalty and personal sympathy, respect, and affection on the part of the vast Indian population for the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland and the Empress of India. I give you, therefore, the health of the Queen, and God bless her. (Cheers.)

The toast was drunk with cordiality.

The CHAIRMAN: I have now to announce that letters of regret for inability to attend have been received from Mr. Gilbert Beith, M.P., Mr. Buchanan, M.P., Mr. Dalziel, M.P., Mr. S. Digby, Mr. Michael Davitt, Mr. Lucy, Captain Cecil Norton, M.P., Mr. H. Paul, M.P., Sir Henry Roscoe, M.P., Sir Bernhard Samuelson, M.P., Mr. Wason, M.P., Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., Mr. C. P. Scott, Mr. Spicer, M.P., and Mr. Schwann, M.P. Mr. Bayley, M.P., is too unwell to be with us. Sir J. Pease, M.P., promised to attend if he could possibly reach town in time. Mr. E. Blake, M.P., writes expressing deep regret that he cannot attend. Mr. Schwann is unfortunately laid up with influenza. Mr. Michael Davitt's letter contains the following:—"I am sorry I cannot stay long enough in London to attend the luncheon which the friends of India are to give to Mr. Alfred Webb. All Irish Home Rulers are naturally proud of the part which Mr. Webb has played at the recent National Congress at Madras. As we are all friends of India, we are all rejoiced to know that our distinguished countryman has rendered signal service to the national cause in India by his able and unanswerable addresses in support of the principles and programme of the Congress." (Loud cheers). It is now my privilege, continued Mr. Stansfeld, to propose to you on this occasion the health of our friend Mr. Webb, and to extend to him an expression of our hearty welcome on his return to this country after fulfilling, with much distinction, ability, and success, his duties as chairman of the tenth National Congress of India. I have read Mr. Webb's opening and concluding addresses as well as something of the proceedings of the Congress and the resolutions passed by it. I do not propose now to dwell upon the latter: this is not the fitting time. But I may refer to Mr. Webb's addresses because we are to-day concerned with him. Of course I assume that almost everybody here has read those addresses. But I may take leave to say that they are distinguished by characteristically clear views from a high standpoint by sympathy with other subject races not unnatural in an Irishman—(cheers)—by justice to their rulers, not always so easy, by charity to all and by counsels of moderation, mutual forbearance and trust. (Hear, hear.) With your leave I may make a quotation or two. Speaking of the exceptional duties in the face of Indian reformers and in view of the vast and varied populations of Indians untrained in political life and unused to self-government, Mr. Webb told his hearers that this gave rise to the greater necessity "that a deaf ear should be turned to the doctrines of despair." That is a lesson which all of us may with advantage study. (Hear, hear.) Lessons of despair are never to be trusted or accepted. Nothing good is obtained in this world by those who despair. Truth is based upon hope and hope leads to the realization of that which is truth. Then Mr. Webb went on to say:—"Yet it is necessary to bear in mind that the period of wakening of the subject peoples is a critical time, before habits of self-restraint and sentiments of responsibility have been acquired, and that mistakes are certain to be made. It is needful therefore to take heed that in the leading of these peoples there should be no just ground of accusation." What could exceed the kindly wisdom of these words? And what must have been the gratification of Mr. Webb to feel in what a spirit of sympathetic acceptance they were received by the native population which he addressed? (Hear, hear.) Gentlemen there are two sides to Mr. Webb's remarks, and to my mind they show a great comprehensiveness of view from a high standpoint as well as practical judgment of detail. The strength of the man who can see both sides, and yet take his own, is a strength which in Mr. Webb's case may to some minds have been disguised by the charm of gentleness—by the gentle persuasiveness of the man. (Hear, hear.) In speaking of India being ruled by Englishmen Mr. Webb does not mark time. He does not say that "though I speak for the native population I wish to take a moderate view and I wish to admit that you as rulers have some merits," but he starts from another point altogether, and he takes a distinct but not inconsistent view which itself is an evidence of reliable strength in any man. He says:—"Never has more conscience been brought to the government of a conquered people." I can understand that some people—many natives as well as English people—will say that there have been no infrequent occasions where there was a want of conscience in the government of India by the English people. (Hear, hear.) That of course is one of the dangers of conquest and despotism, but I believe that the sense of responsibility amongst the English governing classes in the management of the Indian people has led to a better, although a despotic, government than could well have been foreseen. I do not suppose that the history of the world shows a less unfavourable example. Again, speaking of certain defects in criminal procedure, Mr. Webb goes on to say that "as it is the desire of everybody engaged in the government of India to secure impartiality, they would all try their best to remove those defects." I suppose it is admitted that the English people have no more absolutely positive idea than that of the impartial administration of criminal justice. Mr. Webb in his parting address said—"I adhere to all I said regarding the general character of the British Government in India, I adhere to all I wrote concerning the general character of the Indian Civil Service. There has never been any service to equal it." These words were received with approval, and I venture to say that to see this clearly is evidence of judgment, force, and impartiality which ought to compel the respect of Indians and Anglo-Indians here and in India, and of those who have joined us to pay respect to the gentleman who occupied the presidential chair at the late Congress. (Cheers.) Time will not allow me to go into further details or into the evidence of the Press as to the effect produced by Mr. Webb's address on the native and the Anglo-Indian population. But I have here a summary of communications received in England by the British Committee—communications from scores of men of all classes and creeds resident in different provinces and testifying to the admiration and affection which Mr. Webb excited in the minds of all who were brought into contact with him by his wise and sympathetic manner, in the discharges of the duties of the onerous and responsible position which he occupied. (Hear.) I say this because even the Anglo-Indian press, which is most bitterly opposed to the Congress movement, has in no inconsiderable part joined in the chorus of praise, and has alluded to the moderation of Mr. Webb's addresses. I will now sum up in the fewest possible words the conclusions which we are entitled to draw from the facts I have so rapidly brought under your notice. I submit we are entitled to say to all the world of our friend, that he gave wise, moderate and prudent counsels; that his hearers received his counsels favourably; that he showed his appreciation of our civilizing mission in India: and I say, in conclusion, that he did at one and the same time a service which we will take future opportunities of proclaiming, alike to India and to the country from which he came. (Loud cheers.) I beg to propose "Welcome and health to our friend Mr. Alfred Webb." (Renewed cheering.)

The toast was drunk with great enthusiasm.

Mr. WEBB, who was greeted with loud cheers, said in reply: Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Naoroji, Sir William Wedderburn, and Gentlemen,—It would be impossible that I should not feel in the highest degree gratified and flattered by this most kind reception from so many whose good esteem I value, and at the terms in which you, Mr. Stansfeld, have proposed my health. I accept it mainly as due to the high and honourable post that I have just had the privilege of holding, as President of the Indian National Congress. (Hear, hear.) In so far as there may seem to be any personal credit, it is not so much on account of anything I myself accomplished as because of the environment in which I found myself in India, the perfect arrangements for and organisation of the Congress, the reasonable and statesmanlike treatment of the subjects which came up for discussion, and the never failing support of able coadjutors. (Hear, hear.) If at Madras I had found inadequate preparations or disorganisation no poor efforts on my part could have availed to make the Congress a success. In truth, gentlemen, I have come back humbled rather than elated—humbled to think what a small portion of my attention has hitherto been given to the interests of three hundred millions of our fellow subjects, not elated when I remember how little the success of the Congress was due to my own puny efforts. This call to India was a complete surprise. Being, however, a soldier in politics, and realising the honour done to Ireland by the invitation, I felt that wiser men than myself had assigned to me an honourable task which I dare not refuse, and that all that remained for me was to do my best in the position in which I was placed. (Hear, hear.) If the friends of the Congress here and in India are in any degree satisfied with the way in which I fulfilled my trust they have largely to thank the unprepared and diffident state of mind in which I undertook it. There is something in the point of view of the eminent Irish ecclesiastic and patriot, who, having watched the breakdown and humbled retirement of one who had too confidently ascended the orator's chair, said to him: "If you had gone up as you went down, you would have come down as you went up." (Laughter.) It has been one of the greatest privileges of my life to have been permitted to pay this visit to India, and to have shared for ever so short a time the aspirations and sympathies that animate the more enlightened of our fellow subjects in that distant land. (Hear, hear.) To move amongst these men and to look into their faces was to me to learn to love them with a real brotherly affection. They are, to be sure, human and, like ourselves, have faults, and if these faults differ in form from our own there are many reasons why it should be so. The history of the men of India has been different from ours, their ideas and cast of thought are different, as are the circumstances in which they find themselves. (Hear, hear.) It is as yet impossible to realize the general condition of society towards which their evolution tends—towards what they are consciously working or being unconsciously impelled. (Hear, hear.) In all the essential elements of our nature we are, however, closely allied. Not only, as in the words of Carlyle: "All men are to an unspeakable degree brothers, and each man's life a strange emblem of every man's": but are not our race and that of the people of India still more closely allied by the fact that both are branches of the same great Aryan race? (Hear, hear.) I was, while in India, upon more than one occasion profoundly affected by realising this fact from the songs of the people. The Indian mothers, for instance, lull their children to sleep with the same cadences which are to be heard in the nurseries and cabins of my own country. (Hear, hear.) And many of the ancient Vedic hymns sounded to my ears like far off echoes of the chants one has been accustomed to hear in our Christian minsters. (Hear, hear.) There may be great differences between the nations. Yet I am satisfied that if we desire happiness and contentment in India we must apply there the same general principles of government as are called for here. (Cheers.) And if it is acknowledged, as is now generally admitted, that the neglect of those principles in the past (as, for instance, in Ireland) has led to most grievous consequences, it is desirable that no repetition of such mistakes should occur with regard to India. (Hear, hear.) If real sympathy with, and respect for, the governed is necessary in the British Isles it is equally necessary in the Indian Empire, where alas! a contrary spirit at present shown by the dominant race too often makes one blush for one's fellow-countrymen. (Cheers.) Here in the United Kingdom it is now universally admitted that representation is an essential part of the enlightened government of every class of the community, and that no man or party of men, however wise and well-intentioned, dare hope to govern others properly without the assistance of freely chosen representatives of the governed. (Cheers.) Does not the same hold good for India? Here no Civil Service, no constituted authority however pure and high-minded, could safely be permitted to dictate as to principles of government and proceeding. (Hear, hear.) Is it not doubly unsafe to give this permission there? (Hear, hear.) If, in the midst of our comparatively homogeneous society, we feel that the needs of the Irish tenant, the artisan, the labourer, and in short all classes of the community were not properly understood until each class was directly represented in Parliament, how can we expect to act fairly towards the mixed millions of India until their voices also are fully heard in Council either here or within her own borders? (Cheers.) At the present moment these considerations press urgently. We are in a certain sense at the parting of the ways. (Hear, hear.) Opposition from the ancient rulers of the country is finally disposed of. Theirs was in many respects an unfair rule, but it was at least the outcome of the history of the Indian nations, and moulded upon the prejudices and most urgent wants of the people. We, with another history and different prejudices, are now face to face with the problem of the government of the masses of India. Is there not considerable danger that we may blindly press too far and be over-active in wrong directions? (Cheers.) Schools and colleges are doing their work. (Hear, hear.) Everywhere I found that the history of this country was made a subject of study, and the politics of our islands were discussed. The intelligent classes of India, reading and studying this history and these politics, are no more likely than our own people to remain satisfied to be like clay in the hands of the potter. (Cheers.) They are demanding, and will increasingly demand, a share in the government of their own country. This being so, the Congress movement is on every account to be encouraged. One was impressed by the reasonableness of the views expressed both at its meetings and in the conversation of its leaders and representatives. No mistake could be greater than to suppose that its aims are narrow and sectional, or that its members have not at heart the interest of the masses of their people. (Hear, hear.) Through this movement alone can we at present be best made aware of the wants and wishes of India. (Cheers.) It would be as unwise for England to condemn or seek to discourage these gatherings as it would be for mariners to object to buoys and beacons being set upon sunken rocks and reefs. Whether through the Congress or otherwise, the financial condition of India will necessarily force itself more and more upon our attention. (Hear, hear.) The Indian import duties are the necessary consequence of increased expenditure, and the dissatisfaction in Lancashire is the result of those import duties. The strongest condemnation of that reckless expenditure, against which Indian representatives have for years protested, now that the shoe pinches comes from Lancashire. I refer to the opinions circulated within the last few days in a pamphlet by a director of the Blackburn Chamber of Commerce. Our business round this table is with the affairs of India, her needs and difficulties; but as an Irishman my mind naturally turns also towards the present and future of my own country. (Hear, hear.) You, gentlemen, are friends of Ireland; all kindly disposed towards her, many entirely devoted to her service. Will you allow me to draw a parallel between the two countries, which, while in India, has often forced itself upon me? And will you further forgive me if before concluding I venture to point a moral? As President of the Congress I was greatly impressed, as all through my life in Ireland, with the wealth of intellectual sagacity and devotion which, instead of being made use of for the good of the nations and the empire, lies fallow and unused. In Great Britain and her self-governing colonies this intellectual wealth is freely expended for the good of the community, while in Ireland and in India it is forced into private channels or distilled into bitterness. (Hear, hear.) This narrowing in of the intellectual force and devotion of Irishmen and of the natives of India, as well as of every country whose government is external to it, will continue to be a serious loss and drain until through self-government—it may be in very different forms and under very different limitations—the national forces are gathered up and utilised in a natural and wholesome manner. (Loud cheers.) When, in due time, the intellect and devotion of the people of India and of Ireland are drawn out by responsibility and utilised in the same way as are the voluntary services of Englishmen in England and of the colonists in the self-governing colonies, great will be the gain in wealth, power, and contentment not only to India and to Ireland, but also to the British Empire as a whole. And now, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Naoroji, Sir William Wedderburn, and Gentlemen, it only remains for me to thank you for your kind reception and patient hearing, and to assure you that my services as President of the Tenth Indian National Congress have given me some of the richest and most interesting experiences of my life. (Loud cheers.)

MR. GEORGE RUSSELL, M.P.: Mr. Webb has just told us, in the course of his interesting address, an excellent story about an orator who mounted the oratorical rostrum in one mood and came down in another. I rise in the spirit in which that orator came down, for I am quite as conscious as any of my hearers can be of my great unworthiness to follow, even at a respectful distance, a speaker who has had, like Mr. Webb, such unique opportunities of observing the present condition of affairs in India, and of appreciating native sentiment. Mr. Stansfeld, you are aware that we were at one time rather closely associated in Indian business. You are also aware that my interest in all that concerns the moral and political well-being of India has been a very keen one, and, without entering into controversial matters, I think I may confidently make an appeal to your recollection in that regard. It certainly was by no choice of my own that I ceased to be officially associated with the fortunes of India. (Hear.) But in politics, as in cricket, if on being ordered by your captain to change your place in the field, you sulk and refuse to play, or beat the captain about the head with a stump, your side is probably foredoomed to failure. During the time I held the post in the House of Commons to which I have referred, it may well have appeared to some of you—either to natives or to sympathisers with India—that, in what I was able to do, my performances fell short of my professions. It is in truth only too easy for a man in my position to be ground to powder between the upper and the nether millstone —the upper millstone of official discipline, the nether millstone of national aspiration. But I should like to read to you a few words contained in a letter I received from a personal friend after I was transferred to another office. The writer says :—"I shall now await with interest the time when you will come back as Secretary of State, with Mr. Herbert Paul as Under-Secretary, and triumphantly abolish the opium traffic, establish not one but many simultaneous examinations for everything, inflict penal servitude for breaches of the new cantonment rules, and appoint a Royal Commission of Natives to overhaul our finances. (Laughter.) These things I shall not approve, but, even at that price, I shall be glad to have you here again, and you may rely on my loyal co-operation." In these words of gloomy official forecast you may perhaps read some evidence of the policy which would have been mine had I been in a position to give effect to my desires. (Hear, hear.) You will make, I am sure, proper allowance for the exaggeration of official pessimism, but, roughly speaking and in general terms, these words from my official friend in the India Office do not inexactly represent my sentiments with respect to India—sentiments which, whether in the capacity of an official servant of India, or as an unofficial member of Parliament, will always command my sympathy and my best practical efforts. (Cheers.)

Sir William Hunter: It is a surprise to me that I should be asked to speak on this occasion. But it is also a pleasure. For I see around me men who have been for ten years associated in trying to secure the progress of India, and at this table there is one gentleman who with myself belongs to that class of whom Mr. Webb has spoken in modified terms of admiration. Sir William Wedderburn—(hear)—and I were the two civilians who, ten years ago, lifted our voices to welcome the movement which has become the Indian National Congress, and, gentlemen, as life goes on, although we may sometimes diverge in our opinions as to the road of progress, there is no man who, in his own humble sphere of activity, is more desirous than myself to promote the progress of the Indian race. India is a bond among many men in England who differ widely as to home politics. I may perhaps be considered rather as an example to be avoided than as a pattern to be copied, but I wish it to be understood that, whatever a man's opinions may be about English affairs, if he really understands India his heart is with Indian progress. The guidance of that progress is the greatest duty which England has in hand at present. All other questions, even the Irish question, the question of the House of Lords, and domestic questions are really as nothing in the long run compared with the question as to how we are to discharge our duty to our Indian Empire. (Hear, hear.) If I may say so, Mr. Chairman, I regretted to hear the words "subject races" applied to our fellow-subjects in India. It is a most misleading expression. (Hear, hear.) We have heard from Mr. Webb something about previous dynasties in India and, if I were asked as an historical student to discriminate between the dynasties of India in the past and the dynasty of India at present, I should say that the great difference lies in the fact that the previous Indian dynasties have regarded the larger portion of the Indian population as subject races, whereas we regard them as fellow subjects. (Cheers.) We have our Magna Charta for England. There was often difficulty in construing it, for it belonged to a period long gone past. But India, too, has a Magna Charta of her own. It bears the name of the sovereign still reigning—it is Her Majesty's Proclamation of 1858. That is a Magna Charta the interpretation of which admits of no difficulty. It is a Magna Charta which proclaims the equality of all the people and of all the races of India in the sight of the law and as our fellow-subjects of the Queen. It was with much instruction and pleasure that I read the speeches of Mr. Webb to the Congress. I believe you will find that the future progress of India will be rapid in proportion as the demands made by the friends of India are moderate. We should never forget that exaggeration frightens the English public. We have to deal not alone with what is fit and proper for India, but also with the fears and apprehensions of the English people lest Great Britain should lose India, and everything which savours of exaggeration, whether in the Congress or on the platform, tends to retard legitimate progress. I speak as one who sincerely and heartily desires to see accomplished the general programme of the Congress, and as one who believes that that accomplishment will be realised in this present century. (Cheers.)

Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P.: I am sure I need hardly say how pleased and how proud I feel to be present on this occasion. I feel pleased and proud in being able to join in this mark of respect to my esteemed friend Mr. Webb—a mark of respect and gratitude for the admirable and statesmanlike part which he played in presiding over the great Indian Congress. (Hear, hear.) These Congresses are amongst the great events of our day. They show us—I might almost say, automatically—in what direction the future Government of India is to take its course. I need hardly say that Ireland—Nationalist Ireland—(hear, hear) —has always been in thorough sympathy with the aspirations of the people of India. For myself, I am glad to be able to say that I never spoke a word or wrote a line about India—and I have spoken many words and written many lines on that subject—that were not in the fullest and deepest sympathy with that cause which is represented by the great Congress held the other day. I feel pride, too, when I remember that it was an Irishman—perhaps the greatest of Irishmen—Edmund Burke who first endeavoured to arouse in this country a generous sympathy with the races of India. (Cheers.) I specially admire in Mr. Webb's addresses that spirit of moderation, and that spirit of genuine sympathy, which led him to make allowance not only for the feelings of the people but even for the men who, both here and in India, have to govern them. (Hear, hear.) The occasion was one which might perhaps have offered a temptation to exaggeration, or might at least have tempted a display of mere rhetoric. But Mr. Webb showed the moderation and sagacity of a genuine statesman in every sentence of every address that he delivered during his stay in India. I am glad to be able to welcome him back, and to take my part, however small, in a celebration such as this. I think that we in this country are learning much from the people of India as to the way in which India must be governed, and not only that, but also as to the way in which countries nearer home must be governed. I cannot forget that Mr. Webb has borne a very important part in another great fight, and that he has long and consistently advocated the cause of Ireland, and I am therefore all the more delighted to say a few words on such an occasion as this. (Hear, hear.)

Sir Wilfred Lawson, M.P.: I am afraid that I cannot throw any light on the Indian question, for I do not profess to be an Indian expert. I find English politics quite as much, and indeed rather more than, I can understand. (Laughter.) But I was very glad to have the kind invitation to come here to-day. I see so many of my friends around me, especially my friend your chairman. We have all watched his political career, and, so far as I can read his conduct, I think it has been based on the motto of Mr. Burke, that a thing which is morally wrong can never be politically right. I was sorry to see the remarks of Mr. Stansfeld in which he indicated that he was going to retire from political life because it was time to give way to younger men. I do not see why he should do that. (Hear, hear.) There is an old saying that there is no fool like an old fool. (Laughter.) I am not applying that to the chairman, but I am going to say this, that there is no reformer like an old reformer—(cheers)—and if a man, through a long number of years, has retained his old Liberalism he must have the root of the matter in him. I have met many so-called old Liberals who are Tories in reality, and therefore I feel we cannot afford to lose a Liberal like Mr. Stansfeld. I do trust that he will reconsider his determination, and be with us in the many fights which are looming in the not very distant future. (Cheers.) I am glad to meet, too, Mr. Webb. I have only known him well since he came into the House of Commons. I know him as a great fighter for the emancipation of Ireland, and I hope his efforts for the emancipation of that country as well as for that of India will in due time meet with success. He has given us many interesting reminiscences of India, and, when he told us of Indian women singing Irish songs to their children, I thought it would be well worth one's while to go to India to hear the Indian women sing "Kathleen Mavourneen" and "Erin-go-Bragh." (Loud laughter.) I am glad to meet here another friend in Mr. George Russell, who has a very difficult part to play in trying to be at one and the same time an official and a reformer. Most people break down when they try that, but I have great faith in him, because I believe that the official is only external, and that the reformer lies deep in his heart. (Cheers.) I am sure he will remember what Mr. Webb said, that in India at least it had been discovered that there was conscience in the government of a conquered people. I wish there was conscience in the government of all people, whether conquered or not. (Hear, hear.) I wish we had a little more conscience in the government of Ireland by England. (Hear, hear.) We know that conscience in the Government of a country can only be ensured by extending the freedom of that country, wherever it may be. We must always remember what our great leader, Mr. Gladstone, said when someone asked him what thing he had learned most deeply in his long life. He said he had learnt that freedom was a good thing in itself. (Cheers.) And so it is. It is a great thing in itself for every country. I think all we here to-day are friends of freedom not only in India but also in Ireland, and all the world over. (Hear, hear.) We believe that a sensible, rational, safe extension of self-government is the best security for the peace, honour, and glory of all nations. I have had sent me a copy of a poem which was written about a hundred years ago on the subject of English liberty. It describes how England, for generations and centuries, struggled for liberty, and, after expressing a wish that that liberty may be extended through the whole world, it concludes:

"Whate'er their tongue,
Whate'er their hue,
Whate'er the course they may pursue,
Or clime which gave them birth,
Oh, Liberty, may'st thou be given
As bounteous as the light of Heaven
To all the sons of Earth."

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P.: I am very much obliged to the chairman for calling upon me to say a few words. My whole desire in being here to-day was to hear some sympathetic and generous words from our English and Irish sympathisers. These we have had, and, as far as I am concerned, I feel exceedingly gratified with these words. (Hear, hear.) They were words of encouragement and of good advice, and, as far as lies in our power, we shall treasure that advice and try our best to move in the lines of moderation which have been specially recommended to us. (Hear, hear.) One thing is exceedingly satisfactory to me, and that is that we have the testimony of Mr. Webb himself, after his personal experience in presiding over the National Congress, that the proceedings were conducted on reasonable and moderate lines. (Cheers.) That testimony is more valuable to me than anything else, and I assure him on behalf of those who are here present, whether they be Muhammadans, Hindus, or Parsis, that we tender him our sincere thanks and our great gratitude for the manner in which he has fulfilled the mission entrusted to him. When, with the help of Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Blake, and Mr. O'Brien, we selected Mr. Webb to go to India I had not the slightest misgiving as to whether the mission would be a perfect success, for the simple reason that I had come into contact with our guest on many occasions, I had carefully watched his career, and I had satisfied myself that with a calm judicial head he united a sympathetic heart. Knowing this as I did perfectly well, I felt confident that he would be a great accession to the Congress, that he would go there in a sympathetic spirit, and that he would feel the greatest sense of responsibility in undertaking a very difficult and onerous task. (Hear, hear.) My views have been more than fully realised. (Hear, hear.) He has done us a great service. He has shown that the whole object of the Congress was to support British rule and to bring that rule into lines tending to great reforms. (Cheers.) I believe that both our English and our Indian rulers will profit thereby. (Cheers.) On behalf of my countrymen here present I beg to thank our friends for their attendance on this occasion, and for the kind and encouraging words they have addressed to us. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Seymour Keay, M.P.: I had the honour and pleasure of being present at the National Congress at Madras, and I testify to the onerous nature of the task which Mr. Webb fulfilled. In the first place there was an audience of something like 10,000 persons; and in the next place the business for each day necessitated the preparation beforehand of an enormous mass of detail. Mr. Webb was thus occupied from twelve to fourteen hours a day, and that in itself was sufficient to have broken down his health. I had the pleasure of sitting at his right hand during the Congress and sometimes had occasion to warn him of the dangers he ran from undue exposure to the Indian sun. The English press in India are bitterly opposed as a whole to the Congress movement, and the prudence and moderation displayed by Mr. Webb in his opening and closing addresses was one of the things which most irritated that press. I noticed in the *Times of India* a leading article headed "Balaam at Madras," in which the writer said an Irish member had been sent over for the purpose of cursing the Government of India but had turned round and blessed it. I may be wrong in saying so, but I think the passion shown in the leading columns of the leading Anglo-Indian press almost amounted to hatred of the native races of India, and they showed, too, something like hatred for those Europeans who had adopted the cause of India. They treated them as if they were nothing but mere agitators who had come forward to teach the natives that they actually had rights. That was the gravamen of the charge levelled against them. In conclusion, I will only say I trust that the connection which the Irish Parliamentary party have strengthened by sending one of their number to preside over the tenth National Congress of India will continue to grow in strength, and I hope it will lead to an increased attendance on their part when Indian topics are debated in the present and future Sessions of Parliament. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P.: I have no speech to make to-day, and if I had I should be afraid to make it in the presence of gentlemen so well acquainted with Indian affairs. But this I will say, that I do not think there is any one present who sympathises more deeply with the natives of India than I do. (Hear, hear.) Such attention as I have been able to give to Indian matters, and the observations I was able to make a year ago during a comparatively short visit to India, have not enabled me to teach anybody, but have filled me with perplexity as to the almost overwhelming problems to be solved in that country. (Hear, hear.) I am, however, very glad to be here to-day to join with others in bearing my testimony to the efforts of our friend Mr. Alfred Webb and to the manner in which he discharged the duties devolving upon him at Madras. It is interesting to notice in these countries that there are men who have not made themselves widely known or notorious, but who, when they are singled out by their friends for a position of this kind,—a position of the utmost difficulty and responsibility—are able at once to come forward and discharge the duties as admirably as Mr. Webb has done on this occasion. (Hear, hear.) We are glad, too, to be under the presidency of Mr. Stansfeld this morning. I know, and we all know, how during his long career he has been a firm and steadfast friend to nationalities, and how he has himself suffered for his adherence to principle, moral as well as political. (Cheers.)

Mr. A. E. Fletcher: I think the remarks uttered by Mr. Seymour Keay do not apply to the press in this country, for several newspapers have endeavoured to enlighten English people in this country on Indian affairs. I was very much struck with the observations of Sir William Hunter with regard to the objection to styling the Indian people as "subject races." How can they be subject races when you are so much afraid of them that you have to keep them down by perhaps the most costly military system the world has ever known. I think you will never solve Indian problems until you carry out the true Imperial idea that empires, like individuals, should learn not to be envied and feared, but to be trusted and loved. We shall never be entitled to call ourselves masters of India until we have recognised the fact that the greatness of a nation depends, not upon a policy of buffer states or upon the demarcation of scientific frontiers, but upon acting in co-operation with the people themselves, and getting the flower of their manhood to act with our own officials. You will never be entitled to call yourselves masters of India until you have given Home Rule to India—(hear)—until you have won the hearts of the Indian people, and legislated for them on the lines to which the distinguished men who have associated themselves with this movement have given a lifetime of energy and devotion. (Hear, hear.)

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, M.P.: You will see from the toast-list, that I have the privilege and pleasure of proposing the health of the Chairman. I think that we have been peculiarly fortunate in obtaining to-day the presence of Mr. Stansfeld as our Chairman. (Hear, hear.) The object that we have at heart is to draw the people of India nearer to us, and to do so in a way that will promote their best and truest interests. (Hear, hear.) Our desire is that our relations with India should be those of strict justice, and that we should promote her material interest. But beyond that we desire that our rule should be cordially sympathetic towards the people of India. (Cheers.) We also desire always to keep before our eyes the highest ideal of duty, and of moral rectitude; and such being our aims and objects I am sure that we could not have a more fitting representative than our Chairman, Mr. Stansfeld, because, as has already been remarked, during his long, honourable and unselfish career, he has always shown a generous sympathy for national aspirations, and he has also shown a resolute determination to uphold the highest moral standard in all things, whether social or political. (Cheers.) India, gentlemen, during past years and within our own memory has had in the House of Commons such powerful friends as Richard Cobden, John Bright, Henry Fawcett, and Charles Bradlaugh. (Cheers.) There were giants in those days. Mr. Stansfeld belongs rather to their generation than to the generation of newer and younger men, to whom I am sorry to see he is prepared to hand over the duties of the future. I am much afraid that very few of these younger men will be found to come up to the standard of the men I have named. But, if we have no heroic strength, we must try to cultivate in ourselves an heroic heart, so that we may say in the words of Ulysses that though

"We are not now that strength which in old days
Moved earth and heaven, that which we are, we are;
One equal temper of heroic hearts,
Made weak by time and fate but strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

If we feel painfully the individual weakness of the friends of India compared with former friends of India, we must remember that in these latter days strength comes in great measure from combination and co-operation. Victory belongs rather to big battalions than to single heroes. Therefore, we have been anxious to form in the House of Commons an Indian party who will do their best by combined action to make up for the individual weakness of those who desire the welfare of India. (Cheers.) That is a scheme which we have tried to bring forward in an Indian Parliamentary Committee. And there is a new source from which we gain additional strength at the present time. Public opinion in India within the last ten years has become consolidated and organised, and is able now to give a clearer voice to its views through the Indian National Congress, and our great object has been to bring these forces together—to associate the Indian Parliamentary party with the Indian National Congress, and to get them to co-operate. In that sense Mr. Webb has done us good service. He has visited India as a messenger of peace and of good will. He has been a sort of dove out of the ark, and those who have heard his words of wisdom and gentleness may add that he has brought an olive-branch in his mouth. (Hear and laughter.) I think he has shown that all classes in India, official and non-official, European and Indian, may work together harmoniously for the general welfare of India. Such being the case, I do trust that the Government will show a kindly feeling towards this movement which we know under the name of the Indian National Congress. (Hear, hear.) I can assure the Government that the object and feeling of that Congress is purely friendly to the British administration, that its fundamental doctrine is to preserve the overlordship of Great Britain in India. Indeed, in Indian opinion there is no alternative. The people of India do not want Russia in India. They do not want anarchy in India. But they do want the British Government. (Cheers.) What the Indian National Congress does is simply to point out to the British Government how it can remove practical grievances, how it can make its administration more popular, and how it can make firm the foundations of British rule in India. It affords also a genuine expression of Indian public opinion. Members of the Congress are elected in open public meeting in every one of the different provinces of the Indian Empire. (Hear, hear.) Every class and every caste is invited to join. Some of our opponents say that the Congress is not representative. Will they be good enough to tell us in what way we can make it more representative? (Hear, hear.) If they will, we will do our best to act upon their advice. (Hear, hear.) The Congress is a thoroughly practical body, giving really practical advice to the British Government. After all, it is the Indian people who best know where the shoe pinches. I always think that the relationship between Parliament and Indian public opinion is something like the relationship between a doctor and his patient. The patient, however ignorant he may be, knows where his aches and pains lie. He tells the doctor what he feels and what are his symptoms, and it is the duty of the doctor to make a correct diagnosis and find out the remedy, so as to ensure a satisfactory cure. Even if the patient asks for the wrong remedy, it need not be given to him, but at least he must describe what he feels, and it is on that information that the doctor acts. It is in the same way highly advantageous that the British Government should have an opportunity of knowing through the Indian National Congress the real feelings of the people. (Hear, hear.) I would only say it will be with the deepest regret that I shall learn that Mr. Stansfeld has not, as his friends have asked him to do, reconsidered his determination to retire from Parliament. But, whether he remains in the House of Commons or whether he enjoys more leisure outside the House, I do trust that he will continue to give his kindly regard to Indian affairs, and to support us with his wise counsels and with the valuable personal influence he will always carry with him. (Cheers.)

The toast was heartily received.

Mr. STANSFELD: I will not detain you in endeavouring to express my thanks to Sir Wm. Wedderburn for the exceedingly kind way in which he has spoken of me, or for the kind way in which you have received his remarks. I accept all he said, and I accept the way in which you have received what he said, with the gratitude and appreciation which it deserves. I desire to say only one word more before we separate. I was struck during the speech of Sir William Hunter with the declaration that he abjured the phrase "subject races." It did not occur to me that I had inaccurately used that phrase, but still I was delighted to be reproved. Gentlemen, all higher minds in the service of this country in India are of the opinion of Sir Wm. Hunter. (Hear, hear.) But it is not in human nature that the whole mass of the rank and file, military and civil, representing a nation which practically governs a multitude of other nations under its sway—though you may not call them subject races—I say it is not in human nature that every one of them should be full of the sentiment which Sir Wm. Hunter expressed. (Hear, hear.) I admired and indeed expressed my admiration of Mr. Webb's distinct appreciation of the high value of our civil and military services, and especially of our civil service, in India, and of the potency and the character of the men engaged in that service. (Hear.) I think he was right. I think it was a fine thing for a man presiding over that native Congress to take the opportunity of expressing that opinion. (Hear, hear.) But what I would venture to say to those most powerful and resourceful and able men who govern India, on the whole with more conscience than any governing race has ever governed before, is this: that the power in their hands is a power which tends to demoralise those who exercise it if they are not on their guard. The power by virtue of which they exercise it is not their power but is our power, and if it is our power it is our responsibility. (Cheers.) Therefore I would ask them not to forget that, though it is only right and just that we should defer greatly to them on Indian questions because of their trained experience and superior practical knowledge, yet when it comes to questions of great policy and principle, or questions of right and wrong, it is ultimately the opinion of this country and not the opinion of the Services of this country in that great dependency of India, which must determine their action and ours. I am profoundly convinced of the truth of what I have said, and I am glad that Sir William Hunter gave me an opportunity of saying it by the noble sentiments he expressed. I have said it in no spirit of disrespect whatever to the services. I agree, as far as my knowledge goes, with what Mr Webb has said: that it is, of its kind, the finest service that the world has ever known. But, the power being ours and the responsibility being ours, it must be understood sooner or later that the principles and methods of governing that the Legislature in India must observe must be in accordance with the principles and convictions of the English Parliament and of the English people. Gentlemen, I thank you heartily and gratefully for the kind way in which you have listened to me. (Loud cheers.)

The company then separated.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

Writing on February 19th, the *Daily News* said:—The banquet in honour of Mr. Alfred Webb at the National Liberal Club yesterday may hereafter rank as a political event of no slight importance. Mr. Webb has lately returned from his successful presidency of the Indian National Congress, and he was welcomed by a representative gathering, under the chairmanship of Mr. Stansfeld. He had a most difficult position to fill in India, and he performed its duties with rare judgment and tact, and with a thorough devotion to the liberalising principles of the time. His presidency of the Congress has given him a higher place than ever in public esteem. Before he went out, he was known as a capable and upright man. He has returned with the reputation of a statesman. Ardent Nationalist as he is, he might easily have been tempted to turn his speeches into manifestoes of his own political views. He did nothing of the sort, but made the full allowances for the difficulties of the conquering as well as of the conquered races in India, and justly claimed for the people of this country a conscientious sense of their responsibilities. His conclusions from what he saw and heard are therefore entitled to the fullest and the most respectful consideration. They are, in the main, that the happiness and contentment of India are only to be secured by the application of the same general principles of government as those which have been found so successful here. We must learn to rule our great dependency by, as well as for, the people, as we are learning to rule Ireland, and as we have long since learned to rule our Colonies. The whole future of our Empire depends upon our mastery of this great lesson of history and of the signs of the times.

The *Daily Chronicle* wrote:—The complimentary luncheon to Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., at the National Liberal Club yesturday afternoon, was a notable success. The honour was thoroughly well deserved, and it was bestowed with a generous appreciation of his services to the cause of India as President of the tenth annual meeting of the Indian National Congress at Madras in the end of December last. The meeting, over which Mr. Stansfeld, M.P., presided, was widely representative and influential. There was present a goodly number of Members of Parliament, leading members of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, Indian gentlemen representative of various sections of the Indian peoples, and other sympathisers with the popular movements of progress in the Dependency. It was a pity that the Secretary of State for India could not have been present, for the experience might well have shaken his distrust of the National Congress and its supporters in India and here. The recurrent notes of the successive speakers sounded loyalty to the British Raj, cordial co-operation with the Government, and moderation in all things. There is no question whatever on the point of loyalty, for the Government of India and the Home authorities have again and again acknowledged frankly that the heart of India beats soundly towards England. The Indian communities fervently agree in recognising that the continuance of English rule in India is essential to the development and welfare of the country, and they dread the advances of Russia only less than the prospect of being left by us to their own devices. The authorities, however, are far from disposed to welcome assistance in the form that the Congresss-wallahs genially designate co-operation. In this attitude there is an unfortunate misconception. The very position of our officials, and especially the circumstances under which they perform their work, render it impossible for them to know the thoughts and feelings and necessities that press upon the people whose affairs they administer. No one could express more fully and emphatically than Mr. Webb and Mr. Stansfeld the excellence of the qualities that in the main distinguish the civil servants of the Crown in India. But, under the existing conditions, it is beyond human capacity, however able and however well-intentioned, to know all that our civil servants in India ought to know, in order to perform their duties with efficiency. We have laboured to extend the blessings of education to India, and we have held up to the Indian peoples a great example of what education can do for them. They have profited enormously by our educational institutions, and by our practical example. It seems, therefore, to be absurdly impossible to restrain them from following out our teaching to its natural consequences. The successive concessions that have been made by the Government are so many acknowledgments of the force of this reasoning. The difficulty is that the Government delays and yields grudgingly what it ought to concede opportunely and gracefully. Sir William Wedderburn, in his finely toned speech yesterday, said most justly that the patient knows best where his aches and pains are, and that his doctor ought to listen attentively not only to his account of his aches and pains, but also to his mistaken fancies about them. Now there can be no question but the National Congress is able to furnish trustworthy information and useful suggestion, inaccessible to the regular officials, yet such as would enable the Government to minister far more efficiently to the political and social health of India than it can possibly do without such extraneous aid. The barrier really lies in the foolish *amour propre* of officialism—a barrier most difficult to overcome. Almost every speaker testified, as of course, to the marked moderation of the National Congress, and to its careful adherence to practical measures. Still, it is never out of place to remind the Congress-wallahs of the fundamental importance of making each step sure, and taking their public along with them. Sir William Wilson

Hunter, who met with a deservedly warm reception, found that he was pushing an open door when he tentatively recommended moderation. Sir William enforced the necessity of proceeding cautiously, in view of the susceptibilities of the people in this country. We have always urged the same considerations in view also of the ever present danger of outstripping the mental progress of the masses of the Indian populations. The impression left by this pleasant recognition of Mr. Webb's mission must tend to confirm confidence in the ability and discretion that guide the proceedings of the Indian National Congress both in India and at home.

The *Manchester Guardian* said:—One point which ought to be kept in sight was not, we think, touched by any of the friends of India who spoke at the dinner given last night in honour of Mr. Alfred Webb. It is a point on which Mr. Webb himself has wisely laid stress before now. We mean the extent to which Indian methods of government and the habits of mind derived from their practice colour the political views of Englishmen influential in politics at home. The best illustration of this tendency is seen in the writings of the late Sir Henry Maine. After seven years' work in the government of India Maine came back to England to write an impeachment of democracy which must have made and confirmed more Conservatives than almost any other book of its time. It was very brilliant, very subtle, and very perverse. It showed all the force and skill of Maine's muscular and hard-trained mind. The perversity of it lay in the writer's extraordinary estimate of the sense and morality of the average voter of the poorer sort in civilised countries. What we have all heard from the retired colonel about the character of the natives of India, Sir Henry Maine unquestionably assumed to be equally true of the people of England and Ireland. "Roughs and clowns," we think, are the words which he thought sufficiently descriptive of most of the voters in, say, Manchester or Oldham. There is no such school of contempt for popular feeling and opinion as the bureaucratic government of alien and backward races offers to its administrators. We do not on that account condemn that system of government. In its place and time it is necessary, though of course a necessary evil at the best. But we should be jealously on our guard against the demoralising influence which it incidentally exercises even on some of the best and strongest natures employed in its service. Our system of government in India is one of the tributaries which feed the stream of anti-democratic feeling among well-to-do English people of the "professional" class or thereabouts, and a dim sense of this fact has no doubt a good deal to do with the rising inclination of English Liberals to criticise Indian administration with some severity. The other grounds of that inclination were so admirably described last night by Mr. Webb and other speakers that we may be excused for dwelling now on what is no doubt only a small consideration among many others that are more important, but still a consideration that should not be forgotten.

INTERVIEW WITH MR. A. WEBB, M.P.

"We have scarcely ever had a President of Congress equal to Mr. Webb in his thorough-going desire to understand the situation in all its bearings. Throughout he has been moderate, studiously moderate, but I venture to say, no one, certainly no outsider, has been at such pains to master the questions at issue. Most people, after filling such a post as was his at Madras last December for four days, are glad enough to fling business aside when the programme is over. Not so Mr. Webb. He spent days interviewing men connected with the movement, mastering details, studying the relations of the Congress to men and things. One could not but admire his conscientiousness. Don't believe him, if he tells you one can see but little of a strange land in a month. If you set about the matter as he did, you may see more in a month than some people see in a lifetime."

So spoke one who knows the Congress movement from its foundation. I was therefore well prepared for Mr. Webb's observation that a month in India resembles a page out of a book for purposes of criticism.

"How did India impress me? I have enjoyed a great experience, but feel some difficulty in assimilating and arranging all that I have heard and seen. I can only compare it to the rapidly changing pictures a kaleidoscope presents. Perhaps the deepest impression of all is the kindness and courtesy of the people. Although I was only there a month, and am far from desiring exile in a foreign land, yet I quitted India with regret, and only wish that I could return, in acts of sympathy on this side, some of the kindness and attention shown me in India."

"And you found the climate pleasant too?"

"Of course I did. India in December and January has a delightful climate. My friends took care to warn me that I should need to traverse the whole zodiac before generalising upon the climate, and above all to live through July and August in the plains. At any rate, my friends at home found me looking much better for the change."

"How did the Indian people strike you?"

"They are an able people. I was struck by their reasonable ideas, and by their recognition of the necessities and limitations of the political situation in India. A very large number of them have fine intelligent faces; one sees that they are sprung from a noble race. The pathos of the life of the common people impressed me. They are patient, gentle, enduring, hard-working. One hardly ever sees a fierce-looking individual. The Indian plan of life is different from ours. Indians dislike change. To break away from the constituted rules of society is sinful; they cling to the past with wonderful tenacity."

"I suppose you were impressed with India's poverty?"

"Yes, one quickly learns that the 'wealth of India' is mere poetic licence. India is a miserably poor land. The poor belongings of an Indian household—why they are an object lesson in poverty, they speak volumes. I had got the idea that the native savings were always invested in bangles and silver ornaments for the women. I was astonished to find that very often they are mere glass and tinsel, of no value whatever. I expect my idea is true to some extent; but to a much smaller extent than I expected. They lay up in ornaments what the poorest of our people lay up in burial funds."

"Did you come across any examples of striking poverty?"

"At Delhi and other places I went about the poor quarters of the city quite alone, seeing as much as I could. You have only to watch the money transactions of the people to realise how poor they are. An anna is rather less than a penny; there are twelve pie in an anna. As if that were not small enough, each pie is again divided into 21 cowries. I saw the shells piled up in numbers of the poorer native shops. I found a printer's wages 10d. per week for thirty-six hours' work. I was a good deal interested in the tariff hung on the walls of a hotel in a northern city. (Charge of punkahwallah per day or night, 3 annas, keep of a Sahib's dog, 4 annas, horse, 6 annas.) In the face of great poverty, it is easy to understand how a failure in the crops or a slight increase in taxation may cause grave disarrangement of the social organism."

"How did the Anglo-Indian strike you?"

"I was favourably impressed so far as intentions are concerned. I may say that I left with a better impression both of the people and of the government than that which I landed with. And though my time was short, I moved a good deal about when Congress rose. I am persuaded there has never been a body of men equal in their way to Indian Civil Servants. They are strong, trained, able, resourceful. It occurred to me that entrance to the service by means of a competitive examination is not at all the bad system some would have us believe. But though a splendid instrument, they are not the people of India. They should live for India; India does not live for them. I do not feel sure that they sufficiently realise their position in the country. There is not enough consideration for Indian feeling. For hundreds of years England has known nothing of subjection to foreign rule, of its bitterness and humiliation even when the chains are gilded. However excellent are the intentions of rulers, nothing can atone for lack of courtesy, for insufficient consideration of the feelings of the people. It may be questioned whether a bad Government possessing these qualities might not be more secure than a Government almost a model in every other respect."

"Have you read Darmesteter's book in which he sums up our rule in India: '*L'Anglaise n'est point aimé?*'

"No, I have not read it. But, though quite willing to acknowledge that all Anglo-Indians are not the same in respect of discourtesy to the natives, it is certainly far too wide-spread to be lightly passed over. And it is strange to notice that the very people who are most open to blame on this account, are themselves extremely sensitive to criticism. Recollecting that they have the powder and shot, the cannon, and the magazine rifles, the big posts and high pay, it is not too much to expect them to grant the people full use of their tongues."

"Did you personally observe any instances of discourtesy?"

"Yes. On landing at Bombay, it was dark, and there was much confusion. Porters rushed to seize luggage, passengers were disembarking, passengers' friends advancing to meet them. I observed a sailor take a stick and beat back dark-skinned persons indiscriminately down the companion ladder. I have reason to believe that some of the friends who came to meet me were struck. This was the fault of the arrangements, but in England such a thing could hardly occur. Order would be preserved by preconcerted arrangements, not by blows. In a first-class railway carriage, there was empty sleeping accommodation for five persons besides myself in the compartment. The other compartment was for ladies. The only other first-class European passenger, wishing to be alone, settled himself in the ladies' compartment. At a side station some Parsi ladies evidently wished to enter it. To my surprise, the gentleman, looking out of the window, did not get out, and these ladies had to travel second-class. I also heard a young officer cursing and swearing at his servants for irregularities that here would scarcely attract a mild rebuke. However great the provocation, it is not wise. Upon the outward passage I heard language regarding my own people and India that made my cheeks tingle."

"I fancy most people who travel in India have seen as bad as that, and some have observed much worse. How did the Congress pass off, Mr. Webb?"

"Very well. Everything was excellently arranged, like clockwork, so that the President's task was comparatively easy. Those who managed it have certainly a considerable talent for organisation—not too common as we all know. There were said to be 1,200 delegates and 1,800 visitors. It is not an easy task to arrange for such an army. Another thing that impressed me was the admirable command of English that all but a small percentage of the speakers possess, upon the whole,—excellent classic English, different from our slipshod vulgarisms and sentences loosely tacked together. On this side, we hear a great deal about Babu English, and amusing samples are selected for us to read, so that perhaps I am not the only one who had a perverted idea of the real state of affairs. Anyhow, the speaking reached a high average."

"It is whispered that the Sahib himself rather 'hums and haws' when he comes to speak Urdu, or any Indian language, and that only politeness prevents natives displaying their enjoyment."

"Very probably. After the Congress was over a Social Conference met, in which, of course, natives alone could take part. We outsiders were, however, invited to seats on the platform. In many ways it was as interesting as the Congress itself. There was admirable speaking, and resolutions were passed regarding early marriages, nautch girls, the relaxation of caste rules as to foreign travel, the re-marriage of widows, against the use of intoxicants, the establishment of conciliation bodies to settle dissensions between Hindus and Muhammadans, private morals and so forth. Seeing that the resolutions passed at the Congress proper have appeared in the pages of India, I need not specify them."

"I suppose that you will consider the Congress movement a logical outcome of Lord Macaulay's policy as regards the education of the Indian people?"

"Certainly. Nothing else could have been expected. Macaulay foresaw all this, worked actively for it, and yet one would imagine it had come upon some people as a surprise. Danger is likely to result if the Government fail to recognise the expansion of mind which has resulted from Western culture. If the supremacy of the United Kingdom remains absolutely unquestioned, our laws and regulations may be pushed too far. It is for this reason I regard the Congress as valuable, in order to acquaint Government with the wishes of the people. Its true policy ought to be the encouragement of the movement. It affords what is required, a safety-valve. England is quick enough to perceive to what the lack of such an outlet for energy leads among foreign nations."

"Its opponents often say that Congress wants Home Rule for India. Some even explain this to mean every man having a vote and using it against England's supremacy."

"I was impressed by the moderation, the reasonableness of the Congress demands. So far as I could learn, no one even suggested Home Rule for India. I do not remember to have heard it named. And voting, as we understand it, is not on the cards. Indians have their own way of choosing their representatives, a method not unlike that in which the members of Parliament used to be chosen in the old County Courts. As practical men and women, we do not need to trouble about what lies in the remote future. The question for the present is our acceptance of such representation as we find to hand. The official denial of its reality received a severe blow last year when Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji was accorded that wonderful ovation which marks an epoch in India's history. We may be pretty sure it carried its lesson and was well marked."

"I read that you drew some comparisons between India and Ireland, Mr. Webb."

"India is held by a light hand, not so Ireland. All the time I was in India, I do not remember to have seen three British soldiers together; with us, alas! it has been different. I have not forgotten the Mutiny, or the horrors then enacted on both sides. I gazed on the monuments erected to British heroes at Delhi and elsewhere with deep interest. But still, India has not the same bitter memories as Ireland. Government has not interfered with the lives, property, religious convictions, or education of the people, and, whatever difficulties may arise in the future, there must surely be an easier and speedier settlement than Ireland has known."

"Did you travel much in the country when the Congress was over?"

"Yes, considering the time at my disposal, I did a good deal, moving about alone. I saw the work of the Catholic missionaries in Bombay and Madras, and the Friends' missionaries in the Central Provinces. I went into the jungle among the Gonds, a poor, simple people, who dwelt in the land before the Aryan invasion. I deplore the introduction of drink among them; it can have but one end. The very night before our arrival a tiger had carried off an ox from one of the villages. All the time I was there we had fires burning nightly to scare off wild beasts. I found some admirable schools at work, especially under the Catholics in Bombay and Madras, the Friends in the Central Provinces, the Church College at Agra, and technical schools in Baroda. In the latter there is excellent instruction in drawing, modelling, ironwork, carpentry, weaving, dyeing, all practical. Education is one of India's great needs; especially is it necessary to spread the idea that manual labour is honourable, that headwork ought not to be the sole aim of an educated individual. At Alibagh, a few miles out of Bombay, I saw more of the life of the people than elsewhere. One thing there struck me as it has struck me at home: the ancient rights of the people to common lands have been unduly and unwisely interfered with. One practice on the part of the Government seemed to me peculiarly unjust. The land is not always valued on its present condition, but on the condition to which the Government valuers believe it might be brought. There is little doubt that the people are pressed to the furthest verge of subsistence. Regarding the country itself, the people, and the Government, Tennyson's lines return constantly to the mind—

> 'Let knowledge grow from more to more,
> But more of reverence in us dwell.'"

C. S. B.

MR. A. WEBB, M.P., AT BOMBAY.

FAREWELL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESS.

Before returning from India to London, Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., President of the Tenth Congress, delivered a farewell address at the Gaiety Theatre, Bombay, on January 17th. He was received by the audience with loud and prolonged cheers, flowers being showered upon him when he took his seat on the stage. We take the following passages from Mr. Webb's address :—

"WE MUST MAKE UP OUR MINDS."

I cannot adopt the cant that the more one knows about India, the less one knows, or—as it was put by a fellow-passenger the other day—"after thirty years in India you find you know nothing whatever about it." It would be better if such gentlemen said at at once what they mean, that no one but a paid official of the Government has ever any right to aim at knowing anything about India. Such doctrines may suit the "man on the fence," but they would not suit us politicians. We cannot pass our days in philosophic doubt. We must make up our minds upon the questions that come before us. We must act. When Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Sir William Wedderburn say one thing, and Sir Richard Temple and Sir George Chesney another, we are bound to choose between them. After spending a few weeks in India I must be better able to form correct views regarding the country.

THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE.—"HERE TO DO OUR BIDDING."

I adhere to all I said regarding the general character of the Indian Civil Service. Further observations rather tend to strengthen that opinion. There has never been any other service to equal it. Never, until upon the passage out, did I find myself amongst such a number of strong, trained, able, resourceful men. In the House of Commons we are not necessarily chosen on account of our ability to pass certain mental tests. This admission is, however, no warrant for the conclusion that to such men alone should be left the Government of India. A bureaucracy may be a splendid force in its way. Seldom were more bravery and devotion, more spirit and self-abnegation shown than in the South by the planters in the American Civil War. Here a corresponding class should remember that whilst they are a splendid instrument, whilst they can be depended upon to labour for the empire with unceasing devotion, they are not the people of India. They live for India: India does not live for them. In the face of all they may asseverate to the contrary, the electorate of the United Kingdom and the House of Commons are their masters. They are here to do our bidding, and neither appeal nor bluster will in the long run permanently compel us to do theirs.

THE FEELINGS OF THE MASSES.

And in this regard, judging by the language and attitude of Anglo-Indians I have met on shipboard and in India—my ears often tingled—judging by some of my own personal experiences, quite apart from anything I may have heard, there is not, on the part of many of them, enough realisation of their position in this country, enough consideration for the feelings of the masses of those with whom they are brought in contact. Realising the disastrous results of such conduct on the part of a similar class in Ireland, I cannot but presage evil here. "The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small." Such bearing, such conduct in Ireland, has had to the uttermost, in one form or another, to be expiated.

THE MODERATION OF THE CONGRESS.

What especially struck me regarding the speeches at the Congress was their moderation. Yet an official with whom I talked judged many of them as being the contrary. The official class, from which are drawn so many careless of the feelings of others, is the very class most sensitive regarding its own.

I am said to have acted the part of Balaam—to have blessed where you desired I should curse. If so, you yourselves showed singularly little appreciation of the fact. You never said to me "Therefore, now flee thou to thy place." My most moderate utterances were those best received by you both publicly and privately. And any kindness meted out to me before the delivery of the address in which I was said to act the part of Balaam, was as nothing to that which I received afterwards. In my country there is an old song with the refrain "Perhaps it was right to dissemble your love, but why did you kick me downstairs?" I might vary it and ask: "Perhaps it was wise to dissemble your hate, but why did you kill me with kindness?" If the address was moderate in tone, and yet favourably received by you, is this not proof that you yourselves are moderate in your aspirations? Much stronger language would be allowable on your part than on mine. Sympathise as I may, the iron of British Indian rule has not entered my soul as doubtless it often enters yours, any more than has the iron of British Irish rule entered yours. It is easy for an outsider to be moderate.

The proceedings of the Congress were in truth from first to last characterised by the greatest moderation—by greater moderation than they would have been if conducted by Englishmen in their cooler clime treating of subjects of similar moment.

THE CONGRESS "ADMIRABLY ARRANGED."

I have seen many great gatherings, but no other in which the arrangements were so complete, and in which everything passed off so like clock-work. This was, of course, due to the untiring exertions of the Reception Committee, to the officials, and, in no small measure to the volunteers. The presidency of a Congress so admirably arranged and worked proved a comparatively easy task. I can never allow that your people are not in a large measure endowed with the power of organisation.

The first resolution naturally referred to the excise regulations regarding manufactured cotton, which at present occupy so much of the attention of your manufacturers, and concerning which the public opinion of India is almost at one. It is too complicated a question for me to descant upon. I was brought up in a Free-Trade school. But you, I consider, have to the full the same right to try economic experiments as have the Colonies, and your desires should not be sacrificed to the exigencies of party politics at home. But there is little doubt they will continue to be so sacrificed, and that confusion at home is certain to ensue, until in some way India is placed more upon its own feet than at present. Cannot the officials and manufacturing and trading classes who here side with you upon this question, perceive that under the present arrangements you will continue to be played off one against the other,—that when it suits the Home Government, now one, now the other, class will be sacrificed? The arguments so consistently put forward upon most occasions by one party, that Indian public opinion is incompetent to judge wisely, will, by the Home Government, naturally be availed of as an excuse for setting at defiance the united general public opinion of this country.

THE POVERTY OF INDIA.

Personally, I have no means of judging as to the proportion of your population, stated in the third resolution, to be on the verge of starvation, or as to the number of those who every decade perish from starvation. But if from India I carry away any one impression more definite than another, it is concerning the miserable state in which most of your population appear to be immersed. The evidence of my senses ill accorded with the roseate pictures drawn by the ex-officials in the House of Commons. If the condition of the people in and about Bombay, Madras, Itarsi, Agra, Delhi, Baroda, and along the railway lines connecting those centres, is any criterion, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's estimate of Rs. 20 per head as the average annual income of the population of India is not unduly low. I can speak of only what I myself have seen upon the roads, at well sides, in the country bazaars. The gold and silver bangles and ornaments I heard so much about were, for the most part, represented by iron, glass, or tinsel. Compositors' wages in Madras are Rs 3 to Rs 4 per month, for 36 hours per week. Labourers upon the roads in the Central Provinces are paid Rs 4 to Rs 6. In the hotel I stayed at in a northern city, the charge for a punkahwallah per day or night was at 3 annas, while the keep of a horse was put down at 6, and that of a dog at 4 annas. The general use of cowries both in the Central Provinces and in Agra and Delhi is significant proof of the smallness of the transactions and the poverty of the people. A pie, (the fifteenth part of a penny), is divided again into the twelfth part of an anna, 21 cowries. Collections of these shells ready to give in change are piled up upon the boards of most of the poorer shops in Delhi. I was struck with the admirable light-heartedness and good humour of the people under such conditions. The least disarrangement of the social organism, either by failure of crops or otherwise, would certainly plunge them into a condition of hopeless famine. This state of things calls for economy and circumspection on the part of the Government.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS.

The sixth resolution dealt with the much debated question of Simultaneous Examinations. At one time we thought that question was settled by the division on Mr. Paul's resolution; but the representations of the permanent officials have thrown it back into the melting pot with little prospect of its proximate remoulding in a form satisfactory to us. Open competitive examinations may not be a perfect means of ascertaining a man's capacity to serve the Government and the public. But it is surely more likely to be a sufficient test than selection which too often implies subserviency and the exercise of backstairs influence. Strong independent minds, those which it is most desirable to attract, are not always those most likely to commend themselves by the arts which, as we must all feel, are likely to influence in promotion by selection. If the present method of examination is not supposed to be an effective test, would it not be possible to evolve one that would—one in which the memory might have less, and the innate qualities, the judgment of the man, more play? There is no question upon which the Civil Service here appears more united than in its opposition to the simultaneous proposal. It most closely affects their personal interests, and where personal interests are involved no man can be considered an unbiassed judge. There never appeared to ordinary outside mortals a clearer question of right or wrong than that of the disestablishment of the Irish Church. India's Civil Servants can scarcely claim to be better or more unbiassed men than were the clergymen of the Church in Ireland. Yet although the interests of present incumbents were fully guarded, they were, so far as I can recollect, all except a single man opposed to the change. What would have been thought if such a question as that of the Irish Church were to have been decided upon their report alone rather than upon broad common-sense grounds, such as also originally moved the House of Commons regarding Simultaneous Examinations? The resolution in the matter of these examinations rightly declares that in opposition to them a new principle is being introduced inconsistent with the Charter Act of 1833 and the Proclamation of the Queen of 1858—creating a disability founded upon race. No attempt has been made to make out a case against the holding of Simultaneous Examinations for recruitment of the Engineering, Forest, Telegraph and higher Police services.

SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

The twelfth resolution voiced the feelings of the country regarding the necessity for greater separation of the judicial and executive functions. In my conversations with friends in the different parts of India I found no question claimed more attention or was considered to go down deeper to the roots of the social fabric. One gentleman, eminent alike for his talents and his position, went so far as to suggest that a whole Congress should be devoted to its elucidation.

EDUCATION.

Nothing could be more unfortunate than that the Government grants for education should be in any degree curtailed. Education is what India requires before everything. I am glad they have increased from Rx.2,171,000 in 1883-4 to Rx.3,185,000 in 1892-3. But what proportions do these augmentations bear to the military expenditure within the same period—from Rx.17,155,000 to Rx.23,012,000? An opposite process is going on at home, where State assistance for education is less necessary than here. Within the United Kingdom £9,172,000 was in 1893-94 spent in education, whilst £32,000,000 went to the army. In your case education constitutes thirteen per cent., in ours twenty-eight per cent. of the relative military expenditure. It appears to me that technical education is the education here most required. Day by day engineering and mechanical pursuits are affording wider fields for the employment of your young men. It is important that they should be attracted into them, that they should learn that they are as honourable a means of living as, and often more independent than, others generally considered more gentlemanly. An English locomotive superintendent on one of your principal lines lamented to me the difficulty of procuring native employés in what is a comparatively well-paid calling. An English head gardener spoke similarly with regard to his business. Some of the Native States are setting an example. Scarcely anything gave me greater pleasure in India than a visit I paid a few days ago to the admirable technical schools at Baroda. We have nothing at all to equal them in Ireland. They are thoroughly practical in their conception and scope. Above 400 youths are there receiving instruction in all the branches of technical work, from freehand drawing and chemistry, through modelling and ivory carving, to carpentry, iron work, dyeing, and calico printing. The Society of Friends are doing something in the same way regarding ironwork and carpentry at Itarsi. Surely what is possible in a Native State and to a small religious society should be possible to the great Imperial Government? Regarding technical education and some other questions, you have here a freer hand than we at home. Progress upon the best lines is not here fettered by the economic considerations and jealousies (mistaken, as I consider) of the labouring classes.

THE ARMS ACT.

The modification of the rules under the Arms Act sought in your omnibus resolution in no degree clashes with my suggestion that "all questions relating to arms and armed forces of the Crown must be treated with circumspection, that we must weigh well our words and the difficulties of the situation." There can be little doubt that in certain districts liberal concessions of licenses are necessary for the preservation of human life, cattle, and crops. The general policy of the Government regarding arms would be more likely to receive the contentment and loyal support of the people if it proceeded upon uniform, fair, and definite lines. How comes it that rights considered safe in a Native State are not deemed so in British territory? I can scarcely imagine anything more galling, anything more likely to engender bitter feelings than that Europeans *as such* should be allowed to carry arms—that aliens are permitted to enter volunteer corps, from which you are excluded. In so far as licenses are necessary, let them be granted all round. This would hurt no one. If Natives are not permitted to enter volunteer corps, what strength derivable from the maintenance of small bodies of European volunteers is likely to counterbalance the irritation that the exclusion must cause? With us in Ireland the wealthiest Englishman as the humblest peasant has to apply for his license. The formation of volunteer corps is forbidden to all.

INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

I was permitted to move from the chair a resolution which declared: "that this Congress earnestly entreats her Majesty's Government to grant the prayer of her Majesty's Indian subjects, resident in the South African Colonies, by vetoing the Bill of the Colonial Government disfrachising them." Surely this appeal will not be in vain. Surely the great Indian people, proud in their traditions, proud in their anticipations, are not in another portion of the Empire to be classed below what may be the offspring of European civilisation. If the Empire cannot for you enforce parity of treatment in any one of its Colonies, the sooner the better it turns that Colony off on its own account. The very conception of united Empire is shattered by such proposals as those made in South Africa.

THE CONGRESS "YOUR SHEET ANCHOR."

You must hold to this Congress movement as your sheet anchor and sure shield of defence; nothing can imperil or destroy its existence but the abandonment of the safe lines upon which you have hitherto proceeded. Build up the fabric of your liberties upon sober sense, upon ascertained and well digested facts, well put forward, upon adherence to the law, upon a charitable construction of the motives of your opponents. Every effort has been made and will be made to break you up—to cause discord amongst yourselves—to set class against class in this country. None can be truly safe but in the common weal. Cultivate a wide and all-embracing spirit. If you feel intolerable the assumptions of any class here which seeks to dominate you, think how those must feel who in your midst are still marked off from general sympathy. For none have I felt more compassion than for the very poorest, the most despised classes of your people. Surely the brotherhood of man, that great principle upon which the Congress is mainly founded, is a noble idea worthy of all acceptance. To that idea Christianity in all its better and higher manifestations owes its vital force. There is a joy in the principle of human equality that once experienced can never be bartered away. Inequalities there will always remain through natural endowments, through education and opportunities. At least let us make these inequalities as light as possible. It is a joy at home to realise that the man and the woman, the master and the servant, he that blacks our boots or clears out our dustbin, are divided by no artificial lines. It is happier for employer and employed alike that under the Factory Acts the one is compelled to consider the other more than previously. The House of Commons has gained in dignity and usefulness by the presence as members of the sailor, the fireman, the tailor, the shoemaker, and the compositor. . . .

Cultivate a lofty and self-respecting manly spirit, do not imitate those who seek to raise themselves and ingratiate themselves with your rulers by decrying their own abilities and those of their fellow-countrymen. Certain resolutions and declarations of opinion that have caught my eyes in the columns of your newspapers remind me of nothing more than the cringing of slaves who declare that they had rather not be freeman.

How can the Anglo-Indian Government in its heart of hearts continue to regard your movement with aught but approval? It is in truth "the richest fruit of that noble mission of which we, the citizens of the United Kingdom, should be proud, the greatest combined peaceful effort for the good of the largest number of the human race that history has recorded." Wherever I went, in schools and colleges I found your young men studying English history—and what other lesson is to be learned from that history but the desirability for men and nations alike of the steady progress of constitutional liberty? If the Congress is to be regarded with jealousy—discredited, despised, by the official classes—they should at least have been mindful in time, and like the Southern slave-holders made it penal to teach you to read. There was no halting between the two paths. They deliberately chose the better, that which has led to the Congress. This path cannot be retraced. But now another serious bifurcation is before them. Are they prepared by opposition to thwart and embarrass, or by sympathy and advice to help to guide into a secure haven and still waters? Whatever may be the temporary aberrations of baffled ascendancy, I have little doubt as to the decision of that sound sense which in the long run has hitherto characterised the people of the United Kingdom.

Printed by A. BONNER, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 4. (NEW SERIES.)] APRIL, 1895. [SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus" .. 97
A Blundering Strategist 103
Trans-Frontier Aggression 104
The Debate on the Cotton Duties: The Scene in the House of Commons 106
OUR LONDON LETTER 109
Lamaism 111
THE DEBATE ON THE COTTON DUTIES, by Herbert W. Paul, M.P. 113
THE INDIAN PROBLEM: SIR L. GRIFFIN'S GUESSES THEREON. I.—By "A Tartar" 114
II.—By Mr. Jnanen N. Ray 117
ARBITRARY POWER AND FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION, by J. Dacosta 119
SIR R. GARTH ON THE CONGRESS: CRUSHING REPLY TO SIR G. CHESNEY 121
REVIEWS: Hindu Civilisation 123
The Gospel of Buddha 125
The Nurseries of Cholera 127
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects.. 128

Indiana.

The gratitude of all who are interested in the welfare of India is due to Sir Richard Garth for his sympathetic and spirited article in the current number of the *Law Magazine and Review*. We reproduce elsewhere the most essential passages of his temperate and cogent defence of the Indian National Congress against the inexpensive sneers and misrepresentations of Sir George Chesney. The late Chief Justice of Bengal does not hesitate to say that of all the many acts of injustice which have marked the conduct of the Government of India of late years there is none in his opinion "which can at all compare with their insolent treatment of the Indian National Congress." After examining in detail the composition and the aims of the Congress, Sir Richard Garth defies any man "to find fault with the perfect loyalty and respect to her Majesty and the ruling power with which its proceedings are conducted," and he declares that "so far from being in any way objectionable, the Congress affords an open, honest and loyal means of making the views and wishes of the most intelligent section of the Indian people known to the Government." No Congress-wallah could desire more than this and no impartial and well-informed critic would say less. Equally important are the rest of Sir Richard Garth's observations upon the causes of the present discontent in India. Passing over the more deep-seated causes, such as the extravagant increase of military expenditure, Sir R. Garth lays special emphasis upon

> "that arbitrary spirit, that utter want of sympathy and consideration which so often marks the conduct of the Government and some of the higher Civilian officials towards our Indian subjects; and by this I mean not only the masses but gentlemen of rank and position, both native and European, who do not happen to belong to the charmed official circle."

All this is excellent and, coming from the late Chief Justice of Bengal, the warning may well be expected to have no little effect. Sir Richard Garth does not attack, and the Congress does not attack, the Civil Service in India generally. But he says frankly,

> "What I do condemn is that un-English, ungenerous spirit of arbitrary intolerance which pervades more or less the whole official system in India, which is encouraged instead of corrected by some of the leading members of the Service, and which I am quite satisfied is at the root of all the discontent, bitterness, and disaffection which all the friends of India so heartily deplore."

As to the native press Sir Richard Garth repudiates Sir George Chesney's groundless accusations:

> "I can only say I read native papers myself week after week and never see anything there at all approaching sedition or even disloyalty or disrespect to English rule. What I do find there, and what I rejoice to find, is thoroughly well deserved censure of the arbitrary conduct of many of the Government officials. I am afraid this is exactly what the Government would wish to repress. I consider it a most wholesome and salutary means of bringing the misconduct of Government officers to the notice not only of the Indian people but of the Courts of Justice."

Our only regret is that we are not at liberty to reproduce Sir Richard Garth's article in full. We hope, however, that in the columns of the *Law Magazine and Review* it will be read, marked and inwardly digested in India and in England not only by supporters of the Indian National Congress but also by those who, chiefly no doubt through lack of information, are at present apt to look with too little sympathy upon the just claims of their Indian fellow-subjects. Sir Richard Garth has rendered a notable service to the cause of common honesty and common fairness, and he may rest assured that what he has written will be remembered and cited by the friends of India for many a day.

Elsewhere in this issue will be found an article by Mr. Herbert Paul, M.P., on the recent debate on the cotton duties, and an article by a Parliamentary correspondent describing the scene in the House of Commons, and the ignominious collapse of a discreditable manœuvre. There is reason to believe that some of the 107 "Unionists" who voted for Sir H. James's separatist motion felt, after their defeat, a little ashamed of themselves. The enduring recollection that the Conservative members who took part in the division on that eventful day voted, in the proportion of two to one, in favour of making India insolvent and weakening our hold upon the confidence of her people, can hardly be pleasant to the party of all the virtues. Sir Henry James has, indeed, declared that he spoke and voted only as a Lancashire member and not as a Unionist. But this "watertight compartment" theory of responsibility is no more satisfactory than Sir Federick Milner's humourless explanation that the five-lined whip issued to the Unionist party did not tell them on which side they were to vote.

> "No, Sir," wrote Mr. Herbert Paul, in a caustic letter to the editor of the *Times*. "Nor did the urgent summons which we received from Mr. Ellis give us any information. But, limited as we know our intelligence is, it did not occur to any Liberal that our leaders desired us to rally in force round Sir Henry James and the bankruptcy of India. Nor, I am sure, did any Conservative or Liberal Unionist imagine that he was being whipped with five thongs to the support of her Majesty's Ministers. There is, however, a third hypothesis, of which I make a present to Sir Frederick Milner. Mr. Akers Douglas and Mr. Austen Chamberlain may have brought down their men to take advantage of those 'means of escape' so considerately provided in the lobbies for the delicate consciences of statesmen in distress. But my belief in the conscientiousness of my political opponents induce me to fear that there would in that case have been a good deal of uncomfortable and inconvenient overcrowding."

At the same time it would be unfair and ungrateful to ignore the sympathy felt and expressed by many Unionists for the Indian case. As I pointed out last month 51 Conservatives and 14 Liberal Unionists voted against Sir H. James's motion, the most important of the former being Mr. Goschen and Mr. Jackson. These gentlemen, to be sure, only did their duty and are not entitled to any more praise than the Liberal members who, as was to be expected, supported the Government. But nothing could have been more admirable than Mr. Goschen's speech and the vigorous and patriotic opposition which he offered to the supporters of the motion. It has been said, or more often implied, that Mr. Goschen did not make up his mind as to the course he should take until he saw on which side the victory was likely to be. The suggestion is a calumny. Two days before the debate took place Mr. Goschen had informed Mr. Fowler that he intended to speak and to vote against Sir Henry James's motion. Indians who read through the full report of the debate will have observed with satisfaction that most of the speakers laid emphasis upon the imperative necessity of consulting Indian interests and appreciating Indian opinion. It may, however, be well to remind Mr. Fowler that Indian opinion and Anglo-Indian opinion are by no means convertible terms. The remarkable thing is that Lancashire, which was so much excited about the cotton duties a month ago, appears to have little curiosity as to the cause of India's financial embarrassments, even when it is so vividly illustrated as it is now by the Chitral business and the Waziri business. In this connection I am glad to be able to state that the National Reform Union is making preparations for a conference of commercial men and a public meeting in Manchester at which the subject of Indian military expenditure will be fully discussed.

The British public, or that small portion of it which takes notice of Indian affairs, has lately been informed through the columns of the *Times* of the gradual incubation of the latest scheme of trans-frontier aggression. The expedition against Umra Khan in Chitral is, of course, but the most recent development of the insensate and ruinous but continuous policy upon which the Chauvinists at Simla embarked twenty years ago. That policy has been frequently discussed and, so far as the secretiveness of the India Office permits, exposed in our columns. Even the present attack on Chitral was anticipated by Mr. W. Martin Wood in a letter addressed to Professor Vambéry, and published in India for August, 1892. It is to be hoped, though it can hardly be expected, that the recent discussion of the Indian import duties, which brought home to the minds and the pockets of some English constituencies the financial difficulties of the Indian Empire, may direct such attention to this expedition as will cause it to be checked. But, at the time of writing, the matter has received little public notice in London and less in Lancashire, and indeed one can obtain a fairly consecutive account of the filibustering plot only by piecing together scattered references which have been made to it by the Calcutta correspondent of the *Times*.

It is interesting and instructive to trace this information through its various stages. On February 19th last a telegram from Calcutta stated that Drosh fort had been surrendered to Umra Khan, but that he had "written to the British Commissioner in Kunar Valley to say that he has no intention of behaving in any way which is calculated to cause a breach of his present friendly relations with the Government of India." The phrase is exquisitely ironical by contrast with the sequel. A further telegram, dated March 11th, stated, indeed, that alarmist rumours in regard to Chitral were "solely due to the fact that the Executive Council sat till an unusually late hour" on the preceding Thursday, and the correspondent of the *Times* declared that he had "the best authority for asserting that they are entirely devoid of foundation." But this reassuring tone was speedily changed. Four days later the same correspondent telegraphed, bluntly enough: "the division which is to be mobilised against Umra Khan is about 14,000 strong," and he proceeded to enumerate in detail the troops which it would include, and the officers by whom they would be commanded. By an interesting coincidence the St. Petersburg correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed on the same day some strictures of the *Novoe Vremya* upon British interference in the Pamirs. On March 17th a further telegram from Calcutta announced that

> "the projected expedition against Umra Khan has monopolised public attention during the last two days. There is a general consensus of opinion that nothing but the very strongest reasons will justify it, and it rests with the Government to prove the existence of such reasons."

The telegram added that there was no ground for anxiety about Mr. Robertson, but that if Umra Khan did not give way a much larger force than 14,000 men would be required.

> "No doubt, Umra Khan will ultimately be beaten, but victory can hardly fail to cost much life and money and bring new and heavy responsibilities upon the Indian Government."

Another telegram, dated March 19th, brought the news that the Government had issued a proclamation to all the people of Swat and the people of Bajaur who did not side with Umra Khan.

> "The proclamation states that Umra Khan, chief of Jandal, in spite of his oft-repeated assurances of friendship towards the British Government, and regardless of the frequent warnings he has received to refrain from interfering in the affairs of Chitral, which is a protected State under the suzerainty of Kashmir, has forcibly entered the Chitral valley and attacked the Chitrali people. The Government are therefore determined to use force to compel him to retire if he disregards the last warning. Their sole object is to put an end to the present and to prevent any future aggression on the territory of Chitral, and as soon as that object has been attained the force will be withdrawn. There is no intention of permanently occupying the country passed through." . . .

The virtuous language of this proclamation is too well-known to deceive anybody,—least of all, its authors. On March 21st, questions on the subject were put in both Houses of Parliament but, as usual, there was little information contained in the replies. (Even if one goes to the India Office to consult "large maps" he is assured that they are confidential.) Lord Reay and Mr. George Russell stated that, in response to a request for recognition from the *de facto* ruler, Dr. Robertson, the political officer at Gilghit, was sent to Chitral to inquire and report. Of course he ought not to have been sent at all. On March 23rd the *Times* published alarmist telegrams from Calcutta under the heading: "British Reverse in Chitral." It was reported that an attack, resulting in loss of life, had been made by the tribesmen upon a part of the British force supposed to be with Dr. Robertson while a further report announced that Umra Khan had been very active since the news reached him that a British expeditionary force was being organized against him. We are used to developments of this kind. Place an Englishman in a position of danger, and let a few white soldiers be killed, and there is no trans-frontier expedition which will not be sanctioned with alacrity. The whole policy is to be condemned from first to last and, in the present state of feeling in Lancashire, this condemnation ought not to be difficult to obtain, especially as Sir James Westland stated the other day in his speech on the Indian Budget that

> "The sum of Rx. 150,000 for the Chitral Expedition must not be considered as an estimate of the probable cost of the operations if they were undertaken, but as the amount required to put the troops in a position to cross the frontier if necessary."

As we go to press I learn that it is possible that some of the members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee may endeavour to move the adjournment of the House of Commons in order to call attention to the Chitral affair.

With reference to the present aggressive operations in Waziristan an interesting and important communication has passed between the India Office and the International Arbitration Association. The Secretary of this Association on behalf of its Committee addressed the following letter to the Secretary of State:

> "Sir,—The attention of our Committee has been drawn to telegrams and other reports from India indicating that British Indian troops are engaged in another invasion of Afghanistan. From these sources of public information we hear of villages shelled or burned, of cattle taken away by thousands, and all the resources of the tribes being devastated.
>
> "It being one of the objects of this Association to trace the causes and occasions in which hostilities originate, in the hope of being enabled in some degree to obviate or anticipate disputes by means of mediation or arbitration, I am directed to ask if our Committee can be supplied with copies of the official despatches, or with references thereto, which may serve to show what authorities are responsible for the present hostilities against the tribes in Afghanistan, and whether some other method than that of fire and sword may be available for preventing further hostilities beyond the borders of India and expediting the withdrawal of Her Majesty's forces from Afghan territory.
>
> "Though financial matters do not come directly within the

cognisance of our Association, the notoriously adverse state of Indian finance—which such costly expeditions as are now proceeding must aggravate—affords a special reason for our asking to be supplied with copies of official documents that may seem to explain the grounds on which those destructive expeditions have been undertaken."

And this was Sir A. Godley's official reply:

> "I am directed by Mr. Fowler to acknowledge the receipt of your letter asking for copies of official despatches and of all documents connected with the recent operations in Waziristan, and in reply to say that the papers relating to these operations will in due course be laid before Parliament. I am, however, desired to observe that Her Majesty's forces are not engaged in the territory of the Amír of Afghanistan."

This concluding observation that Sir Arthur Godley is "desired" to make, indicates that some sensitive fibre still remains in the otherwise case-hardened political conscience of the irresponsible but powerful promoters of these raids into the mountain ranges beyond the Indian frontier. But as they are hit in a sore place, evasion, as usual, is resorted to. This may be traced when we compare the two phrases, the International Arbitration Association's "another invasion of Afghanistan," and the India Offices's "not engaged in the territory of the Amír of Afghanistan". This evasion obviously invites the rejoinder—if Waziristan is not in the territory of the Amír, whose territory is it? Neither the Secretary of State nor Sir Arthur Godley will dare to assert that it is British territory which Her Majesty's forces are now overrunning. And yet if they cannot so assert, will they be good enough to explain when and how "the consent of both Houses of Parliament", as prescribed by the Statute of 1858, has been obtained for sanction of the heavy "expenditure incurred in these military operations carried on beyond the external boundaries of Her Majesty's Indian possessions." These are the terms of the Act, which, so far as the public have any means of knowing, are being flagrantly transgressed by this new "invasion of Afghanistan." As to the geography of the matter, any of the maps of the period furnish sufficient answer. Of course, we are well aware of the gerrymandering drift of the Durand-Kabul Treaty, which the promoters of these raids dare not yet allow to be published. The Waziris were certainly no parties to that Treaty, and they can only regard our troops as ruthless invaders of what are their territories if not the Amír's. For the rest, let our readers, also Her Majesty's Secretary of State, refer to the irrefutable statement in our last number, "The War in Waziristan."

With reference to the promised inquiry into the expenditure of the Indian revenues Sir W. Wedderburn, as Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, forwarded on March 15th the following important communication to the Secretary of State:

> "I have the honour, on behalf of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, to draw your attention to a question, put down by Mr. Samuel Smith for Thursday next, regarding the promised inquiry into Indian expenditure. The original undertaking, which was given in consideration of the withdrawal of Mr. Smith's motion on the 15th of August last, was that a Select Committee of the House of Commons would be proposed. But in your speech of the 12th February last an opinion was expressed favourable to the alternative of 'an impartial, small, but thoroughly efficient Royal Commission.' The Indian Parliamentary Committee are confident that the object of the Government is to make the inquiry as effective as possible for the object in view, and they do not at present desire to express an opinion as to the comparative advantages of a Select Committee and a Royal Commission. But considering how much would depend upon the composition of any proposed Royal Commission, they trust that you will not take steps towards altering the nature of the promised inquiry without the assent of the members to whom the undertaking was given."

Mr. Fowler, whose severe illness is universally regretted, has formally acknowledged the receipt of this letter, and is, I understand, desirous of replying himself to Mr. S. Smith's question in the House of Commons.

On March 14th, Mr. Hanbury and Sir Richard Temple, both of whom had voted on February 21st against the cotton duties, moved and seconded a resolution declaring that the military appropriations in aid paid by India, in addition to her payment of the cost of the British army in India, and of its transport to and from India were excessive and unjust to India. The resolution, which was negatived by 88 votes to 25, evoked alike in Parliament and in the Press a remarkably strong expression of opinion in favour of full and impartial inquiry. This is what the Government has promised, although the fulfilment of the promise is being delayed. There is, as the *Times* said,

> "one thing necessary for the settlement of this and many similar disputes—namely, a clear and intelligible statement of facts. This we do not get in the Army Estimates which seem deliberately constructed with the view to make it impossible to gain exact knowledge concerning the cost of any given service."

I thank the *Times* for that frank admission. It applies to only too much official "information," especially from the India Office. Mr. Campbell-Bannerman certainly overstated his case. The *Times* wrote that he

> "was evidently in excellent good humour, unwilling to see a defect anywhere, and almost as convinced as Dr. Pangloss himself that everything is for the best in the best of all possible worlds;"

while even the *Daily News* admitted that Mr. Campbell-Bannerman's arguments

> "were too much like a repetition of the old official doctrine that, were it not for India, we should want no army at all."

"Reference was made," the *Standard* said, "to the employment for Imperial purposes of native troops. No doubt, if they supplement our own, we ought to bear a proper percentage of the necessary outlay." Finally, the securely-judging *Globe* declared that:

> "the present Parliamentary Session ought to be favourably recorded by the future historian as that in which the British

conscience first began to show uneasiness about 'injustice to India'."

Yet, I suppose, the heaven-born "experts" in India will continue to declaim against "Parliamentary interference" in Indian affairs.

Sir William Harcourt stated, in reply to a question put to him by Sir William Wedderburn on February 28th., that, in conjunction with Mr. Fowler, he had come to the conclusion that the cost of the Opium Commission ought to be borne by the English Exchequer and not by the Government of India. The decision, which involves a tardy act of justice, is better late than never. It would have been manifestly unfair to charge the taxpayers of India with the expenses, or any part of the expenses, of investigations for which they had not asked and which many of them did not wish. How much needless irritation would have been avoided if the British Government instead of making this declaration at the eleventh hour, had made it in the first instance. But, after all, the cost of the Opium Commission is the merest drop in the ocean compared with the growing military expenditure of the Government of India. Sir W. Wedderburn asked Mr. Fowler on March 1st what was the total expenditure incurred by the Government of India, and by the Kashmir State, on the Gilghit Agency since the date of its establishment. Mr. Fowler was not able to give the information, but promised to ask the Government of India to supply it.

I am but reiterating the opinion of an Anglo-Indian of high distinction and long experience when I say that the appointment of Sir C. Crosthwaite to the India Council is deplorable. The vacancy ought not to have been filled at all. Even if it had been necessary to fill it, there was no good reason for selecting a man who, not to put too fine a point on the matter, has been a distinct failure as a Lieutenant-Governor. Sir Auckland Colvin, for example, would have been much more suitable. If he had been appointed we should have had at least one voice in the India Council to protest against excessive military expenditure. Liberals who are interested in the welfare of India may well ask what is the use of having a Liberal Secretary of State and a Liberal Viceroy if appointments like Sir C. Crosthwaite's continue to be made. It is hard to see, and hard to say, why—until the India Council is abolished—it should not be recruited from Indian experience. I may add that this suggestion was made a few days ago by Sir W. Wedderburn in a letter addressed by him, as Chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, to Mr. Fowler. The terms of the letter were as follows:

> "Having regard to recent vacancies in the Council of the Secretary of State for India, and to other prospective vacancies, the Indian Parliamentary Committee desire to urge upon you the appointment to the Council of one or more Indian gentlemen of position and experience. The Committee believe that such appointments would give great satisfaction in India, and would bring valuable assistance to the Secretary of State in ascertaining the wants and wishes of Her Majesty's subjects in India."

As two more vacancies will occur in the India Council at the end of the year, the Secretary of State, who has acknowledged the receipt of Sir W. Wedderburn's letter, will have a good opportunity of carrying out this suggestion.

In this connection, I may direct attention to the words used by Mr. J. Bryce, M.P., in an address which he delivered in London on March 13th last at the annual meeting of the Association of Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom:

> "Nothing was of more service to a department of the Government which was anxious to make itself a true servant of the public than to have the opportunity of gathering first hand from the lips of the leaders of commerce of this country an idea of the thoughts and subjects which occupied them, of the methods which they applied to the solution of commercial problems, and of the general trend and sweep of opinion upon those subjects with which the legislature had to deal. (Hear, hear.)"

Mutatis mutandis, these words are not less, but more closely applicable to the work of governing India. What is true of commerce is true of politics—nothing is more necessary to a Government than that it should be well-informed as to the wants and wishes of those in whose interests it has to legislate or govern. The need is specially urgent where a foreign Government is administering the affairs of a dependency so little understood and so diversely constituted as British India. What is really remarkable is that a maxim which is so commonly accepted and so usefully acted upon where English interests are concerned, should be treated as dangerous or visionary when it is applied to India.

An Indian correspondent, who holds deservedly a commanding position in the politics of Bombay and of India, writes to me: Lord Sandhurst has been favourably received by the people of Bombay. Our Municipal Corporation greeted him on his landing with an address heartily welcoming His Excellency. To this he made a sympathetic reply. He promised that every matter which came before him with reference to our Municipal Corporation should receive his most earnest and sympathetic consideration; and, further, that "it will always be my aim to secure and maintain as far as possible sympathetic and harmonious relations between the Government and the Corporation." These are wise and hopeful words, addressed to the citizens of Bombay. To the people of the Presidency he gave the assurance that "it is my resolve to do my utmost for the happiness of its people, of all classes and creeds." The mail steamer which brought Lord Sandhurst brought at the same time a report of Lord Sandhurst's speech at the dinner given to him by the Northbrook Society. The indication which he gave in that speech that he would hold Mountstuart Elphinstone as his model in his policy towards the people of this country, and observe strict impartiality in his dealings with various classes and interests, have also given satisfaction here. It is true that the government of India—in which the opinion of its thinking people is day by day becoming a more prominent factor—is growing more difficult; but the difficulties are not insurmountable if our rulers will shape their policy with due regard to that factor, and be guided in their measures by their own generous and noble English instincts more than by the views of the bureaucracy.

Our best hopes are (my correspondent continues) centred in Lord Sandhurst, and our prayer is that he may have strength and courage to fulfil them. The departure of Lord Harris and the coming of Lord Sandhurst have so far had this result on the mind of our people—they have made them breathe more freely, in the hope that under the new *régime* the pendulum of administrative policy and work, which has moved backwards during the last five years, so far as that movement depends upon the personal character and sympathy of a Governor, will hereafter swing forward. We entertain an earnest desire that during the next five years there will be less reason for unrest, and less proneness among different classes to disagreement than has been exhibited of late. If Lord Sandhurst makes a careful and friendly study of the opinions of the vernacular press in this Presidency, and shapes his course in the impartial interests of all classes, he will come nearer to the fulfilment of his duties as an ideal Governor of Bombay. Let us hope that our best wishes for his success in the Government of Bombay may be fulfilled. We are prepared to make ample allowances for the difficulties of his position, and at times even to sympathise with him when we differ from him. On the whole, he will find that the people of this Presidency, nay, of India, are not very hard to please. Sympathy is what they greatly need at the present moment.

It will be remembered that the Madras Congress, over which a sudden gloom was cast by the death of the Mahárájá of Mysore, passed a resolution expressing its sympathy with the royal family of Mysore in their bereavement. The resolution also testified to the Congress's "deep sense of the loss which has been sustained in the death of the Mahárájá of Mysore not only by the State over which he ruled with such wisdom, ability and obedience, but also by all the Indian peoples to whom his constitutional reign was at once a vindication of their political capacity, an example for their active emulation, and an earnest of their future political liberties." The following letter has been received in acknowledgment of the resolution :—

To Alfred Webb, Esq., M.P.,
President of the Tenth Indian National Congress,

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that your kind telegram on behalf of the Tenth Indian National Congress, conveying their condolence and sympathy with the Mysore Royal Family in their present sad bereavement has been placed by me before Her Highness the Mahárání. Her Highness feels deeply grateful for this message, embodying as it does the feelings of appreciation, by such a representative body as the Indian National Congress, of the good qualities of His Highness the late Mahárájá, and the success and usefulness of his brief administration. Her Highness requests you to accept for yourself and to convey to the members of the Congress her sincere thanks for the kindly sentiments in your message and for the special marks of respect shown to the memory of His late Highness by the Congress.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
(Sd.) K. Sheshadri Iyer,
Dewan of Mysore.

The reports of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Public Petitions make mention of the following petitions in favour of simultaneous examinations to the Civil Service of India :

Feb. 6. Inhabitants of Dhubri, in public meeting assembled on the 31st August, 1894; Vishnu Chandra, chairman. (*Mr. Paul.*)
,, Inhabitants of Barahanagar, in public meeting assembled; Raya Yatindra Nath, chairman. (*Mr. Paul.*)
,, Inhabitants of Purulia, in public meeting assembled; Chandra Sekha Lewry, chairman. (*Mr. Paul.*)
,, Inhabitants of Patna, in public meeting assembled at Bankipur on the 27th November, 1894, Bissinur Sing, chairman. (*Mr. Paul.*)
Feb. 20. Inhabitants of Berhampur, in public meeting assembled; B. K. Chacubutty, chairman. (*Mr. Naoroji.*)
,, Inhabitants of Vijayanagram, in public meeting assembled on the 16th August, 1894, H. Ramanujachari, chairman. (*Mr. Naoroji.*)
,, Inhabitants of Maimansingh, in public meeting assembled; Amath Bandhu Guba, chairman. (*Mr. Naoroji.*)
,, There-undersigned (2,689) inhabitants of the Punjab. (*Mr. Naoroji.*)
,, There-undersigned (4,472) inhabitants of the Punjab. (*Mr. Naoroji.*)
Feb. 25. There-undersigned (2,889) inhabitants of the Punjab. (*Mr. Naoroji.*)
,, There-undersigned (78) inhabitants of Saswand, in public meeting assembled. (*Mr. Naoroji.*)
Mar. 8. There-undersigned (1,714) inhabitants of Poona, Bombay Presidency. (*Mr. Naoroji.*)
,, There-undersigned (1,240) inhabitants of Poona, Bombay Presidency. (*Mr. Naoroji*)
,, There-undersigned (466) inhabitants of Sadalga, Bombay Presidency. (*Mr. Naoroji.*)
,, There-undersigned (49) inhabitants of Ratinagiri, Bombay Presidency. (*Mr. Naoroji.*)
,, There-undersigned (80) inhabitants of Chikodi, Bombay Presidency. (*Mr. Naoroji.*)
,, Inhabitants of Allahabad, in public meeting assembled on the 13th August, 1894; Pandit Bishum Charnitti, chairman. (*Mr. Naoroji.*)

The summary states that twenty-one petitions, bearing 13,693 signatures have been presented in favour of simultaneous examinations, and in estimating the significance of these figures it must be remembered that most of the petitions are signed only by the chairmen of large public meetings. In the appendix to the report the Dhubri petition, the terms of which are repeated in many other petitions, is printed in full. The agitation in India will undoubtedly continue until the House of Commons sees fit to carry out its resolution, while in the House of Commons itself Mr. Naoroji has given notice of a further motion, the text of which will be found on another page, calling upon Parliament to fulfil its pledges.

FIDUS.

A BLUNDERING STRATEGIST.

THE new edition of General Chesney's well-known work on Indian Polity[1] is substantially a new book. The changes of a quarter of a century have materially altered the political and administrative conditions with which the author deals. But years, which bring the philosophic mind to some, have not bestowed that gift upon General Chesney. So far as he is engaged with boiling down history books and Blue-books, or with the statement of facts within his departmental cognisance, the author is on solid ground, and cannot go far astray. But when he comes to draw deductions, and to assume the attitude of critical or constructive statesmanship, he needs to be regarded with great indulgence. He offers himself as a helpless target to the aggressive or remorseless critic, and a butt to the free-handed satirist. Apart from his useful summary of facts, we cannot discern any real value in his volume. His attitude on Indian questions is ultra-official, and therefore destitute of helpfulness. Indeed, it is positively hurtful, for it warps his own mind not merely on matters of opinion but even on matters of fact, and it imports a very acrid feeling into the discussion of questions that cannot be brought to a solution without judicial calmness of temper. As it so happens, there is nothing within the boards of the volume which discredits General Chesney's authority more completely and pitiably than his foolishly rancorous attack upon the National Congress — the "so-called National Congress." The General delivers his attack with directness and vigour, but his intelligence department has ruined his strategy. The "so-called National Congress," he says—he said substantially the same thing in a monthly periodical last year—"although also" (that is, like the vernacular press) "thoroughly disloyal, is less mischievous, because of the absurd character of its proceedings." Now there is no more deadly quality that any movement can possess than absurdity, and if the Congress were only absurd General Chesney would no more be seriously angry with it than he would with a troupe of Yoghis. As for the alleged disloyalty, very much higher authorities than General Chesney have honourably and emphatically disclaimed the charge. "They always set out indeed," says General Chesney, "with a profession of loyalty to the British Government"—which is not true in fact, though they do on suitable occasions profess a genuine loyalty — "but the resolutions they embody," he continues, "are distinctly aimed at rendering that government impossible." Yet, as a matter of dry fact, the Government of India has adopted and embodied in statutes some of the most important of these very resolutions,—for example, the Indian Councils Act of 1892. But, says General Chesney, "the "proposal" for "this expansion in size and function of the legislative councils" "emanated from the Government of India." In one sense, yes; in essential fact, certainly not. "That was a reform, I take leave to say," writes Sir Richard Garth, ex-Chief Justice of Bengal, in the current number of the *Law Magazine and Review*, "entirely due to the strenuous exertions of the Congress."

> "It was proposed and carried at their very first meeting, in 1885," Sir Richard continues. "They pressed it in vain upon the attention of the Government year after year, until at last Mr. Gladstone yielded to their urgent solicitations by passing the Act of 1892.
>
> "It certainly is rather amusing, under the circumstances," proceeds Sir Richard, "to find Sir George Chesney, in the last edition of his 'Indian Polity,' actually modest enough to take credit to the Government of India for passing the measure, which they had been steadily resisting as long as they could, and which they were only obliged to take in hand at last for the purpose of *defeating*, as far as possible, the more liberal intentions of Parliament."

For other resolutions of the Congress we commend to Sir George Chesney's attention the subsequent part of Sir Richard Garth's drastic article. Once more: "The self-elected delegates," says General Chesney, "who make up that body" (meaning the "so-called" National Congress) "are in great part pleaders in the law courts, and ex-students from the Government College in want of employment, a class yearly increasing under our system of free education, the class, in fact, which works the native press, with which the Congress is in close alliance." Again we avail ourselves of Sir Richard Garth's championship:

> "The Indian National Congress is a large, influential, and important assembly of earnest and patriotic gentlemen. . . . . They consist of delegates from every part of India, who are duly elected at a number of divisional headquarters. We are told that at the Congress meeting in Allahabad, in the year 1888, fully three millions of men took a direct part in the election of these delegates, who themselves numbered no fewer than 1,248. The constitution of this important body was

---

[1] "Indian Polity: a View of the System of Administration in India." By General Sir George Chesney, K.C.B., M.P. Third Edition. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

> thoroughly representative; it consisted of princes, rajahs, nawabs, fifty-four members of noble families, members of Council, honorary magistrates, chairmen and commissioners of municipalities, fellows of universities, members of local boards, and professional men, such as engineers, merchants, bankers, journalists, landed proprietors, shop-keepers, clergymen, priests, professors of colleges, zemindars, and others. I should also say that they were thoroughly representative as regards religion, as well as their rank and profession. The Hindus, of various castes, numbered 964; the Muhammadans, 222; the Christians, 38; the Jains, 11."

Sir George Chesney's statement is thus shown to be "utterly unfounded." "So far as Bengal is con- " cerned," says the ex-Chief Justice, "I know it to " be untrue. . . . It is also utterly untrue that " they are, as Sir George Chesney would suggest, " *an isolated class.* They are no more isolated than " the members of the Carlton or the Reform or any " other club in London; and I may also say that I " know many native gentlemen of high rank and " position who, although thoroughly favourable to " its views, have been deterred from taking as direct " and open a part in the Congress proceedings as " they would have wished to do, by the determined " jealous hostility which the Government have mani- " fested towards the movement." Sir Richard lays on a heavy hand, and we spare here to add further humiliation. The importance of the exposure of Sir George Chesney's attack on the Congress lies in the fact that his attitude throughout the book, on every point of Indian policy and administration, is essentially at variance with the views of the National Congress. If General Chesney, posing as an historian, personally experienced in Indian life and Indian administration, is capable of so grossly misrepresenting the National Congress, its composition, objects, spirit, and proceedings, as we have shown, what possible value can be attached to his deductions, criticisms, and suggestions? There can be no more dangerous counsellor than the man who has official prestige and personal experience, but who is so hopelessly prejudiced that he firmly shuts his eyes to the most obvious facts of the situation.

General Chesney's book will possess value to students of Indian polity on account of its convenient summary exposition of the constitution and working of the machinery of government. But it must always be read with critical vigilance. Thus, in his remarks on education, the writer emphasises the admittedly weak points, while he shows a lack of appreciation of the strong mental side of the Indian character which would amaze mature students like Professor Max Müller or the late Sir Henry Maine. He looks with the jaundiced eye of an arbitrary official upon the native press, making no allowances for its peculiar conditions. The tone of the vernacular press, "with a few honourable exceptions," he says, "is scurrilous and mendacious to " a degree unexampled in any other country, habitu- " ally and with uniform persistency misrepresenting " the actions and intentions of the Government, and " striving to foment disloyalty towards it, and hatred " of the English in India." This tirade, being interpreted, simply means that Sir George differs from the native press in opinion. What does Sir Richard Garth think of it? To his judicial mind any attempted coercion of the native press "would be a " most disastrous step."

> "What Sir George calls sedition," says the ex-Chie Justice, "I do not know. I can only say I read native papers myself week after week, and never see anything there at all approaching sedition, or even disloyalty or disrespect to English rule. What I do find there, and what I rejoice to find, is thoroughly well deserved censure of the arbitrary conduct of many of the Government officials. I am afraid this is exactly what the Government would wish to repress. I consider it a most wholesome and salutary means of bringing the misconduct of Government officers to the notice not only of the Indian public, but of the Courts of Justice. In many remote parts of the Indian Mofussil this action of the press is literally the only means of bringing such offences to light, and of preventing the most outrageous acts of petty tyranny."

If any wrong-headed apologist of officialism in India ever received a thorough drubbing, that man is Sir George Chesney, and no more authoritative hand could have applied the lash than ex-Chief Justice Sir Richard Garth. These specimens of Sir George's vicious and hot-headed obscurantism may suffice. It is not worth while to prolong the agony of the victim. But we trust this castigation of General Chesney will open the eyes of those who are disposed to rely upon opinions fortified by official rank, and who neglect to look beyond the speaker to the facts on which his argument is based.

TRANS-FRONTIER AGGRESSION.

In a letter published in the *Times* of April, 1887, the late Earl Grey said:—"I am persuaded that the " only wise policy for this country to pursue is to " keep absolutely aloof from all the quarrels of the " Afghans and our other neighbours, and to avoid " all meddling with their affairs unlesss, by plunder- " ing our subjects or by other acts, they inflict upon " us injuries which ought always to be promptly " punished. . . As it is in the nature of the half- " barbarous States of Central Asia to be never long " free from revolutions, their rulers are never secure " from falling. The fall of one who has been " supported by the Indian Government, which may " take place at any moment, will have the appear- " ance of a reverse to that Government." The warning conveyed in these sentences had already come from the unsatisfactory result of the action previously taken under the misguided policy, and had the Government, when they adopted that policy, been compelled to act in accordance with the British Constitution and apply to Parliament for supplies, they would not have involved the taxpayer in the present war of conquest without justifying its expediency to the representatives of the British constituencies. Availing themselves of the circumstance that the control of the Indian treasury was intrusted to a member of the Cabinet, they used the Indian revenue in defraying the cost of eighteen years of unsuccessful warfare, and have now brought about a most critical state of things. From the telegrams of the *Times* correspondent, which we briefly summarise in "Indiana," it would appear that the alternative left us under existing circumstances is either to retire from Chitral with considerable loss of prestige, or to resume, with much larger forces than those we have hitherto employed, the hopeless struggle of subjugating the borderland of Afghanistan. According to those telegrams the British representative is shut up, with eight English officers and 500 soldiers, in the fort of Chitral, where he is threatened by Umra Khan, the ruler of Bajaur, who has advanced with a strong force to deliver the Chitral territory from the presence of the unbelievers. On the 15th March an army of 14,000 troops was being mobilised at Peshawar for the relief of the British mission at Chitral, but two days later it was declared that a much larger force would be needed, as we should have to cross the territories of the Swatis and the Utman Khel, who could put 20,000 men in the field, while Umra Khan could raise nearly as many, and the Bonerwals, Mohmands and other neighbouring tribes might also take up arms againsts us. The lands of all these tribes were devastated by us in our unsuccessful attempts of recent years to bring them under subjection and these wrongs have doubtless inspired them with strong feelings of resentment and distrust. Already what is called "a British reverse" is reported in the usual alarmist fashion. The Indian Government, however, are making every effort to prevent a combination among the tribesmen, and such efforts may prove successful provided that the terms offered are sufficiently enticing. Meanwhile an ultimatum has been sent to Umra Khan to evacuate the Chitral territory by the 1st April, but he is not likely to obey the mandate unless stronger modes of persuasion are used, seeing how defiantly he disregarded similar threats in 1891, 1893 and 1894.

The Government have had no communication for many weeks with their representative at Chitral, and much anxiety is naturally felt regarding his fate. At the same time the unpreparedness of the Indian Government to meet the present contingency seems calculated to excite wonder as well as regret, seeing that the danger of the situation was known and publicly discussed in India in February last, as the following statements in the *Pioneer* of the 27th and 28th of that month will show:—"The disturbing "factor is Umra Khan, and the only method "of putting direct pressure upon him is for the "Afghan Commander-in-Chief to detach a force "Northwards. Should Umra Khan persist in "holding Kila Darosh, the Government of India "would have to decide whether a column should not "move from Peshawar. This would be a trouble-"some expedition to undertake, as Swat would have "to be crossed, and our force would have the Swatis "and Bonerwals in their rear. These tribes are ugly "customers, and we have been roughly handled by "the latter, since which the Government have been "careful to leave them alone." These circumstances should, at a much earlier period, have been taken into serious consideration. But we seem, from the statements quoted above and from the *Times* telegrams, to have turned our eyes towards the Afghan army for assistance, and to have bethought ourselves of diplomacy and rupees for restraining the anticipated hostility of neighbouring tribes. In Waziristan and the last Afghan war we were generous to tribal chiefs at the expense of the Indian taxpayer, and the utter failure, which was the outcome on those occasions of methods so un-English, might have taught us wisdom for the future.

The critical situation in Chitral, dangerous as the Government consider it according to the *Times* of the 22nd March, is not our only frontier trouble at present. The war in Waziristan, undertaken in October last for the subjugation of the local tribes, has failed to accomplish that object, and if the construction of our projected railway through the Zhob valley is not to be given up, or the whole ruinous policy abandoned, those tribal territories will again have to be overrun by a British Indian army. Moreover, an incident recorded in the *Civil and Military Gazette* seems likely to lead to serious complications with the Governor of Kandahar, and possibly with his master, the Amír of Kabul: for it is scarcely to be presumed that the British Government will fail to exact reparation for the grievous insult and injury said to have been inflicted by Afghan officials on a British subject in the service of the Government of India. "Mirza Mahomed Taki, British news-"writer at Kandahar, has arrived at Sibi, having "been compelled to leave Afghan territory, owing "to the persecution and despotism of the Afghan "officials and been otherwise harassed in his move-"ments in obtaining news. All these inconveniences "he would have endured patiently; but when his "grown-up daughter was outraged, and then burnt to "death, as stated by him, he managed to effect his "escape to British territory, though great vigilance "was exercised in preventing his departure. Mirza "Mahomed Taki entered the British service fifteen "years ago as Sheristadar to Colonel Oliver St. John. "When Kandahar was taken he rendered valuable "service to the Government, and also during the "Boundary Commission under Sir West Ridgway. "He was present at the Penjdeh affair when he nar-"rowly escaped the thrust of a Cossack lance, and "was instrumental in affording information to the "Government concerning Herat" (*Pioneer*, Feb. 9, 1895). Now the moral of all these incidents and complications is one and the same. The British and Anglo-Indian policy of trans-frontier aggression is hopelessly and irremediably bad. The *Times* stated on March 25th, on the authority of its Calcutta correspondent, that public opinion in India "is inclined to blame the diplomacy which allowed him [Mr. Robertson] to get into such a critical position" at Chitral. With that opinion we cordially agree. Mr. Robertson has no business in Chitral at all. But such "critical positions" are of the essence of the "forward" policy which is ruining the financial position of India, and all to no purpose. Mr. Fowler's promised Committee or Commission of Inquiry cannot be appointed too soon, nor can it rationally neglect to take these vital matters into its earnest consideration.

THE DEBATE ON THE COTTON DUTIES.

THE SCENE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

[FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.]

The sitting of the House of Commons on February 21st was one of those great occasions when the bonds of conventionality are broken, and the human nature in the great assembly comes to the surface. Its soul is laid bare, the good and evil which are always working half out of sight are revealed, and in "one crowded hour of glorious life" the very human House of Commons is seen at its best and at its worst. A debate upon Indian finance is not sufficient to bring the House to this point of sensitive vitality. Indian topics are always seriously discussed, but the discussion is usually confined to a small section of experts. The average member, who has no personal experience of India, commonly finds the problems of Indian affairs beyond his comprehension, and after making conscientious but unsuccessful efforts to master them is content to resign himself to indifference and avoid the debate. It is seldom that any great party issue is involved such as would command the attention of the mere party man. But import duties on Lancashire manufactures have always brought the subject of Indian finance home very closely and almost poignantly to the representatives of certain Lancashire constituencies. It was so in the old days when constant efforts were made to get those barriers to the extension of Lancashire trade removed, and it is perhaps natural that it should be more so now when, in a time of trade depression and working-class distress, a serious blow seemed to be struck at a languishing industry by the reimposition of these burdens and restrictions.

But even this added interest was not sufficient to drive the House of Commons into a ferment of emotion and excitement. As a matter of fact, the Lancashire members and the Lancashire people took the recent imposition of the cotton duties with remarkable calmness. From their interest in the currency question they have been well aware of the terrible straits of Indian financiers, and knew that, under the present circumstances, the imposition of the duties was practically unavoidable, and that the Government had not failed to consider the interests of Lancashire. Certain individuals and isolated groups spoke warmly, but there was a general reluctance to make a serious attack upon the Government. When the House met after the recess there was an absolute refusal to raise the question by way of amendment to the Address in reply to the Queen's Speech, where it would necessarily have taken the form of a vote of censure on the Government. But as time went on the Lancashire members consulted together and met their constituents in conference, and finding that, apart from the general policy, there were distinct grievances, or alleged grievances, in detail (such as the protective character of the duties notwithstanding the efforts which had been made by a countervailing excise duty to prevent them being protective), they decided that a general discussion and frank exchange of views with the Government in a friendly spirit would clear up all misunderstandings, and probably lead to the removal of any irritating sense of injustice. It was at first suggested that a large deputation should be sent to the Secretary of State for India, but afterwards it was thought that a full debate in the House of Commons would be more satisfactory. This debate could only be obtained by creating an occasion, the most usual expedient being to move the adjournment of the House. This is frequently done, and there was nothing to suggest that such a debate would not run the ordinary course and be free from the entanglement of party strife. Someone would move the adjournment, the twenty or thirty members interested would, without distinction of party, state their grievance, the Government would reply, and in case the reply was not considered satisfactory the handful of aggrieved members would make a formal protest by forcing the motion to a division, in which they would go into one lobby and all the rest of the House would go into the other; the motion for adjournment would be rejected by a majority of ten to one, and the protest being made the House would resume its ordinary business, whilst the Government pondered over the clearly expressed views of those who felt aggrieved, and would perhaps devise a remedy. This is the usual course, this was what was intended, but this was not what occurred.

The discussion of small matters is dominated by greater issues. The Government of Lord Rosebery is only kept in power by the possession of a small majority of votes fluctuating from about 12 to 20. Its position is, therefore, always precarious, and it is faced by an enemy animated not only by party differences, but by personal hatred—the bitter enmity of disappointed ambition and thwarted intrigue. Mr. Chamberlain's efforts against them never cease. He is a unique figure in Parliament—a clever debater, an unscrupulous plotter, never resting from endeavours to create a situation of danger for the Government, to contrive some ambuscade, or effect some combination or revolt by which the ministers he hates may find themselves in a minority. He has dragged the whole Opposition into one factious enterprise after another, leading them to vote in close succession for a series of contradictory propositions, leading them to vote for resolutions to which they are in principle directly opposed. Over and over again, scores of times, the Government have defeated or escaped these tactics. But the enemy never rests.

On the day before that which had been chosen for the debate on the cotton duties, the rumour spread like wildfire that an intrigue more dangerous more daring, and more unscrupulous than any previous effort was on foot. The knowledge that amongst the Lancashire members who might be expected to vote against the Government, there were ten or a dozen who on ordinary party questions were amongst their supporters suggested the desperate plot. If the whole of the Conservative and Unionist members, including the agricultural members, the Anglo-Indians and all the other classes who were more in sympathy with India than Lancashire, could be induced to vote with the Lancashire revolters, there would be a majority against the Government. The proposal did not seem feasible. It supposed the readiness of a great number of men to vote against their most deeply cherished principles, to throw themselves in the very wantonness of faction into a quarrel with which they had nothing to do, and then to vote on the wrong side in order to snatch a party advantage. But it was known on the night before the debate that the leaders of the party had been won over to the plot, and that all the party machinery was being employed to make it successful. Here was a crisis. This it was which lifted the quiet, almost friendly difference between the Government and a small section of the House into a political situation of the gravest and greatest importance. Within twenty-four hours the Government were to be defeated and hurled from power, Parliament would be at once dissolved and the country would be in the throes of a great struggle. Wild alarms were sounded in all the papers, Liberal and Conservative members of the House of Commons and the House of Lords and crowds of strangers hurried down to the palace of St. Stephen's. The lobbies were seething with excitement, the House itself was in a state of highly-strung nervous agitation. This was the setting for a great scene.

Sir Henry James, a Unionist, a great lawyer, one of the oldest members of the House, and a man who has held high office under the Crown had been selected on this occasion, as on others, to be the spokesman for his fellow-members from Lancashire. When he found into what a vortex he had been hurled, it is said that he tried to avoid it by postponing his resolution. He made private overtures to the Government but they refused to agree to any postponement. They were face to face with an intrigue. Their life hung by a thread. They would neither delay nor compromise. The ground was chosen and the hour had come, they had a clear conscience and an honourable principle to defend, they would fight to the last, fight it out there and then, and if they fell, assailed by such a combination, they might be defeated but could not be disgraced. Sir Henry James must go on.

In a crowded House Sir Henry James rose. His oratory has been described as a combination of the bar, the pulpit and the stage. It has many of the effective qualities of each, but lacks the most important of them all. It lacks sincerity. Seldom has he seemed more insincere than on this occasion. He spoke for an hour in a low strained voice. He spoke to an audience which gave him no assistance. If the bulk of his audience were going to be driven against their principles to vote with him, they were not obliged to cheer him. The rest were bitterly hostile. Even the small band of Lancashire members for whom he was speaking were in no mood for demonstrations. However honest, sincere and earnest they might be in their objection to the duties, they had been trapped by the intriguer, and their non-political protest was being made the catspaw of a political manœuvre. They were bound to go on but a cloud was upon them. Thus it was that Sir Henry James laboured along in a chilling silence before a strained, watchful, unresponsive audience. If the question had been regarded simply from the Lancashire point of view, much of his argument would have seemed fair and reasonable. He argued that Lancashire ought to have been consulted; that the duties might have been imposed in such a way as to avoid any trace of protection; that Lancashire could not and would not injure her Indian competitors, but objected to being handicapped in the race. He showed that distress and depression existed in the Lancashire trade, and pleaded that some other way should have been found of relieving the Indian Treasury than by reducing the Lancashire mills to silence and her toiling millions to poverty. There were in Sir H. James's speech evident touches of unreality and exaggeration which did not help his case, and once he went beyond his brief in suggesting that the duties were the outcome, not so much of India's financial necessities, as of a conspiracy between Anglo-Indian officials and Bombay millowners to cripple Lancashire and fill their own pockets. This insinuation gave Mr. Fowler an excellent opportunity of testing the feeling of the the House. Almost at the opening of his speech in reply, he repelled the insinuation with scorn. The ice was broken, and the silence of the audience disappeared in warm and sympathetic cheers. Mr. Fowler was in no temporising mood. He spoke out with that boldness and frankness which secures the confidence of a British audience. His first care was to clear himself. He showed that he had been attacked by Indian merchants for favouring Lancashire, as much as by Lancashire merchants for favouring India. These criticisms were, he argued, a testimony to his impartiality. Then, turning to the specific grievance, he related with lucidity and a deft mastery over figures the story of the growth of the Indian deficit—adopting, as usual, the official theory—and showed how necessary it was to impose the import duties. Then, striking the kernel of the question from a Lancashire point of view, he protested that the Government were as determined as Sir Henry James that the duties should not be protective. He showed how he had endeavoured to avoid all taint of protection in what was purely an impost for revenue purposes, and declared emphatically that if the Lancashire members could show that the import duties and the countervailing excise duty still left an opening for protection, the opening should be closed. This offer granted all that most of the Lancashire members were asking. The speech so far had been a long and able practical argument. It had entirely eclipsed the wire-drawn, forensic pleadings of Sir Henry James. It had rung an entirely different note and, as it demolished one argument after another, or nailed an unworthy insinuation to the counter, the speaker was encouraged with warm cheers and exclamations of approval. Mr. Fowler was evidently capturing the sympathies of the House and even of those who were ordered to vote against him. But he did not forget that the great issue before the House that day was not to be decided by such considerations as whether he did well to draw the line at 20's or at 24's, or whether he should have fixed the countervailing duty at 3½ per cent or at 5 per cent. The question beneath and above and beyond these was whether the Government was to be destroyed by a factious intrigue, and whether the interests of the great Indian empire were to be made the shuttlecock in the merest party game. Mr. Fowler concluded his speech with a powerful appeal to to the best instincts of each man in his audience. He reminded them of the great trust confided to them in the individual responsibility which each had for the wise, just and generous government of India, and appealed to them not to be led away by any selfish or party feeling. The passage was eloquent and direct. The growing feeling in the House which, as his speech proceeded, had been rising higher and higher in unrestrained enthusiasm was now swept along in a whirlwind of responsive emotion. Cheers broke out in all parts of the House—not the cheers which re-echo when one party triumphs over the other, not the cheer which acclaims the political gladiator when he delivers some flashing stroke at his foe, but those deeper, more emotional cheers which rise like a spiritual impulse from the heart of the listener, answering to the heartfelt eloquence of the speaker. That was the turning point of the debate. In those deep cheers which the House of Commons hears so seldom, there sounded the thankfulness of many that a great crime was not yet accomplished, that there was still time to be true to their better instincts, and their higher patriotism. In that moment, the plot against the life of the Government, the mean intrigue of the renegade, failed and died.

It is beyond belief that the plot could have succeeded. It only needed a dozen or fewer righteous men amongst the Opposition to vote with the Government in order to nullify the loss of the Lancashire Liberal votes and leave the balance of parties as before; and no matter what pressure had been put upon their followers by the leaders of the Opposition, there were many they could not have coerced. But some of the leaders themselves were in revolt against the plot. Mr. Balfour was away ill. His place was taken by Mr. Goschen, and it is well known that amongst his other intrigues Mr. Chamberlain is intriguing within his own party against Mr. Goschen. There is not much love lost between them. Mr. Goschen, therefore, to whom justice has hardly been done, found little difficulty in repudiating the miserable tactics which had been forced upon his party and declaring himself to be on the side of the Government. On the minor matter in dispute he made the practical suggestion that there should be a conference between representatives of the textile industries of India and of England, and an effort made to accommodate the diverse interests. On the great question before the House he spoke with a warm and generous enthusiasm of the necessity for all British dealings with Indian affairs being controlled by high motives. His speech was mainly addressed to his own party—begging them to be true to themselves and their better feelings. Such an address from the acting leader of his party, going counter to his official chiefs and their independent allies, is an unusual spectacle, and made a great sensation. It may well have been an heroic enterprise. The courage of it has been discounted, and perhaps unfairly discounted, by the fact that Mr. Goschen knew before he spoke that the feeling of most of those he addressed had already swung over to the views he advocated.

In the interval between the speeches of Mr. Fowler and Mr. Goschen a great change had come over the House. When the Secretary for India sat down the great mass of members surged out into the lobbies to discuss the effect of that great deliverance. One after another proclaimed his adhesion to the Government. The defection became a stampede, and in a brief moment of deep feeling the wretched plot came to the ground with a crash, and failure was written large across the sinister intrigue. A handful of members continued the debate in an empty House. The Lancashire members made their speeches on the smaller issue, arguing with one another about counts and tariffs, the cost of production of yarns and cloth, and the extent to which Indian cotton and American cotton could be respectively employed. After this quiet commonplace interval the debate leaped with a bound to the highest and acutest interest by the interposition of Mr. Goschen, and then it was all over. The division came, and instead of a majority of the House, only 109 members voted with Sir Henry James. Great numbers of the Conservatives abstained from voting, and others voted with the Government. Only 109 of the 670 members of the House were found at the end of the evening in support of a motion which had, a few hours before, been trumpeted to the world as likely to prove fatal to the Government. Nothing further seemed to be necessary in order to complete the dramatic changes of the day. But one more touch was added. Mr. Chamberlain, the contriver of the plot, who at the opening of the day seemed already to stand triumphant on the threshold of his long looked-for victory, at the end touched the lowest depths of parliamentary humiliation. All through the debate he had been looking more and more dejected. As the forces he had counted upon rallied to the standard of Mr. Goschen, or withdrew entirely from the contest, he saw an overwhelming defeat coming upon him. He had not committed himself publicly before the House to either side, but of course the part he had played was well known. He might, however, still save his reputation with the more ignorant public by deserting the remnant of his party and voting with the Government. He swayed towards the Government lobby. But in the moment of the division one of his followers remonstrated and led him into the opposing lobby. Even there it appears that his courage again failed him, and he shrank from appearing as a supporter of his own lost and discredited cause. He entered the lobby but did not come out of it until after the division was complete. It was not known until the next day what had become of him. Then, amidst shouts of laughter and ridicule, the humiliating story was brought to light that in order to evade the necessity of voting he had played a game of hide and seek with the officers of the House, and found a means of escape, concealing himself in some remote and ignoble recess. This was the end of the great debate, in which both individuals and the House of Commons had touched the highest spirit and the lowest depths of its ever changing dramatic life. Mr. Fowler and Mr. Goschen both achieved a noble triumph, each sufficient to make a Parliamentary reputation, and the House of Commons surmounted with added humour a crisis which covered a very pitfall of disgrace.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Readers of India will be happy to learn that Mr. H. H. Fowler, who has suffered from severe illness during the past month, is now progressing favourably towards recovery.

An illustration of the effect produced by Mr. Fowler's speech on the Indian cotton duties was afforded incidentally at the Mansion House on March 18th. The Master of Trinity was lecturing on Burke to the students of the London Society for the Extension of University Teaching, and dwelt, among other points, on the extent to which Burke had brought home to the consciences of Englishmen their responsibility for the good government of India. In this connection Dr. Butler quoted, amid applause, the peroration of Mr. Fowler's speech—sentences, he said, from a minister who "seemed for a time to speak in Burke's spirit, and with not a little of Burke's power."

The Queen has been graciously pleased to signify her intention to confer the Imperial Order of the Crown of India upon Mrs. Henry Fowler, wife of the Secretary of State for India, and upon Lady Sandhurst, wife of the Governor of Bombay.

Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., Mr. Seymour Keay, M.P., and Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., have each given notice of the following motion, which stands in their names on the order-book of the House of Commons: That, in the opinion of this House, no reference to a Select Committee or Royal Commission on Indian affairs will be satisfactory unless it permits inquiry as to whether (a) the economic condition of the people of India is such as to enable them to bear their existing financial burdens; (b) the Indian revenues have been applied in accordance with existing statutes; and (c) any portion of the expenditure is incurred on objects financially beneficial to the United Kingdom.

A statement of expenditure incurred on account of military expeditions to Gilghit, Chilas, Hunza, and intervening places, during the financial years 1890-91 to 1892-93 inclusive, has just been published as a Parliamentary Paper. The expenditure on the Gilghit mission during this period was 62,220 rupees (extra expenditure in connection with the troops proceeding to Gilghit); that on the Gilghit agency was 1,02,508 rupees, and includes charges in connection with Hunza and Nagar and the escort of the British Agent at Gilghit; and that connected with the transport arrangement in Kashmir by Captain Yielding for the food supply, etc., of the troops serving in the Gilghit agency, 8,66,615 rupees, making a total of 10,31,343 rupees.

The writer of the article on "Indian Affairs" in the *Times* said on March 25th: The Parliamentary return of "Indian Military Expenditure Beyond the Frontier" gives emphasis to the comments of the Indian press and to the questions asked last Thursday in both Houses on the expedition to Chitral. The serious news since received leaves no doubt as to the necessity of prompt action. It is not often, however, that such an expedition—designed to set free a beleaguered British officer and to put down a pretender in arms—runs counter to public opinion in India. Our Calcutta correspondent informs us that one Bombay paper had, in opposition to the general sentiment on the other side of India, expressed its approval. But the apparent disproportion of the means to the ostensible end seems to have struck critics both in India and England; nor does a momentary check to a small detachment affect the main issues involved. The Parliamentary return shows that, during the ten years ending 1891, the Indian military expenditure beyond the frontier exceeded 128 millions of rupees, besides the annual subsidy to the Amir of Afghanistan. Those who have the financial stability of India at heart, whether in that country or in the Lords or Commons at home, naturally wish to know how far this heavy burden is due to the local exigencies of Indian frontier defence, and how far to the great game of British-Russian diplomacy in which India finds herself involved. The causes which have led to the present complication in Chitral, taken along with the Pamir negotiations now going on in St. Petersburg, give fresh point to such questionings.

Sir Lepel Griffin has not taken much by the lecture which he delivered at a meeting of the East India Association, held at the Westminster Townhall, on March 6th. The Duke of Devonshire, who took the chair, said that Sir L. Griffin's opinions "would receive all the careful consideration to which his knowledge and experience were entitled"—a suitably vague expression. At the close of the paper, which is discussed elsewhere in two signed articles, the Duke of Devonshire added, again in a severely non-committal phrase, that it "contained much matter for serious reflection" Care was taken at the time, however, that this reflection should not be publicly conducted, as the closure was vigorously enforced against the many gentlemen, Indians and others, who wished to reply to Sir L. Griffin. Afterwards, it is true, the East India Association repented and gave the opposition a chance of being heard, though not by the Duke of Devonshire nor by Sir L. Griffin.

A conference organised by Mr. Sarat Mullick on behalf of the Edinburgh Indian Association was held in the Union on March 9th. There were about 100 persons present. Mr. Mahalanobis presided, and, opening the conference, referred to the indifference of the average British elector to Indian affairs. Mr. Sarat Mullick was the chief speaker. He moved—"That the time has come for an extension of the system of representative government in India." He referred to the representative element which is to be found in the ancient village communities of India, and pointed out the great progress that India has made recently in education and in political matters. In conclusion he exhorted the audience to take their proper share of interest in Indian political questions.

Mr. M. S. Raw, B.Sc., seconded the resolution, and referred to the Indian National Congress and the Mysore Representative Assembly, which, he said, proved that Indians were ready for an extension of representative government. Many other speakers followed, and the opinion of the meeting was strongly in favour of the motion. The various political societies in the city were represented at the conference.

"We can only," writes General Sir John Adye, in his recently published "Recollections of a Military Life," "govern successfully by gradually entrusting power to the natural leaders of the people. I have heard it said sometimes that such principles as I advocate would, if carried out, cause to us the loss of the Empire of India, and my reply is that if such principles are *not* carried out we shall not only lose India, but shall deserve to do so. . . . . We hear a great deal nowadays of the depreciation of the rupee, but in our government of India unless we act on the principles which I have endeavoured to illustrate, we may find in the days to come that we have a far more dangerous result to face, and that is the depreciation in the character of the millions under our rule. . . . . It is often said that India has been won by the sword, and must be governed by the sword. The first statement is to a great measure true; but to the second, as laying down a principle of government, I demur. No nation can be permanently or successfully *governed* by the sword."

As to trans-frontier aggression, Sir John Adye is of opinion that "our policy towards our somewhat turbulent neighbours should be one of forbearance and conciliation, combined in some cases with subsidies." The Afghan war of 1878-79, he holds, was "bad in policy and unjust in principle from beginning to end."

The friendliness shown to the Irish party by the invitation of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., to preside over the Indian National Congress was reciprocated by the invitation of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., to the St. Patrick's Day Banquet, held at the Holborn Restaurant. Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., presided and among the other guests were Mr. John Dillon, M.P., and Mr. T. P. O'Connor, M.P., whilst Mr. Augustine Birrell, M.P., was present as a Scottish member, and Mr. W. P. Byles, M.P., as an English representative. Wales was represented by two members—Major Jones, M.P., and Mr. Lloyd George, M.P.

Lord Harris's return made very little noise here. The *Times*, it is true, published in small type a paragraph stating that a very cordial reception was given to him at Dover upon his return to his seat, Belmont, near Faversham, and that at Faversham, "where the boat train was specially stopped," the Town Council gave Lord Harris an official welcome. But these inevitable demonstrations would hardly compensate Lord Harris for the expressions of hostile opinion which, thanks to the imprudent action of some of his friends, marked his departure from Bombay. Lord Lytton, with all his faults, was permitted to depart from India in peace. But when attempts were made in Bombay to secure an artificial demonstration in Lord Harris's favour it became necessary for Indian opinion to declare itself. That it declared itself to some purpose is shown in the bulky volume of "Opinions of the Indian Press on Lord Harris's Administration" which has been and is being widely circulated in this country.

The following important motion, in the name of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., appears in the order-book of the House of Commons: That, in the opinion of this House, in order to preserve and maintain the stability of the British power, the loyalty, confidence, contentment, and gratitude of the people of British India, to improve their material and moral condition, and to increase largely commercial and industrial benefits to the people of the United Kingdom, it is expedient that the solemn pledges of the Act of 1833, of the Proclamation of 1858 after the Mutiny, of the Proclamation of 1877 on the assumption of the Imperial title at the great Delhi Durbar, and of the further confirmation of these Proclamations on the Jubilee by Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen and Empress of India, should be fulfilled by, among other reforms, giving effect to the Resolution adopted by this House on 3rd June, 1893, viz.: That all open competitive examinations heretofore held in England alone for appointments to the Civil Services of India shall henceforth be held simultaneously both in India and England, such examinations in both countries being identical in their nature, and all who compete being finally classified in one list according to merit.

Sir Henry Rawlinson, in his long and honoured career which closed three weeks ago, played many parts, and he played them all well. He was eminent as a soldier, a diplomatist and a scholar, one of those powerful and well-constructed natures able to turn from one subject to another without undue effort, and yet so solid, so accurate, so devoted to fact and truth as to be removed altogether from the category of merely versatile and accomplished persons. Alike as political agent in Afghanistan upwards of half a century ago, as a director of the East India Company, and a member, later on, of the India Council, as an investigator into Oriental archæology and antiquities, and as a valued member of many learned societies, Sir Henry Rawlinson achieved success and fame based on lasting and solid work.

We have almost forgotten now (the *Daily Chronicle* says) the various political complications in Afghanistan early in the forties, but the work done by Sir Henry Rawlinson in the deciphering of inscriptions can never be forgotten, for on that work is based a great modern science. It was reserved for the nineteenth century to discover the chief remains of the most ancient periods of civilisation and to unveil their meaning. This was the special achievement of Sir Henry Rawlinson, who discovered the methods of deciphering the cuneiform inscriptions of Persia, Babylonia, and Assyria. In 1836 Rawlinson deciphered the inscription at Behistun, which contains many hundreds of lines, gives an account of the genealogy of Darius Hystaspes and the chief events of his reign. It was, indeed, Rawlinson who first gave us our reliable knowledge of the great Oriental monarchies, glimpses of which had through so many generations been familiar to the readers of the Old Testament. Through Rawlinson's labours we know with a fair measure of accuracy the history of this long submerged, dim, and imposing Oriental world, some of whose strange remains are now gazed on by visitors to our modern gallaries and museums. If the astronomer who reveals to us worlds rolling through space of whose existence we were ignorant is deserving of our gratitude and admiration, even more so is he who uncovers for us the early monuments of our race, and who helps us to realise more clearly the evolution of human society on this planet. This is the work which Sir Henry Rawlinson did, and by which he has merited the fame which his name will long enjoy.

An important paper—the result of many years of study—on "Village Communities in Southern India" has been read before the Indian Section of the Society of Arts by Mr. C. Khrishna Menon, lecturer on agriculture at the Sydapet College, Madras. We hope to deal fully with Mr. Menon's paper on a future occasion.

Mr. Asquith, in the course of a speech delivered at Cambridge on March 20th, referred again to the cotton duties. "What are those duties?" he asked. "The Government of India has a large and growing expenditure to meet. It has a poor population with a limited power of sustaining taxation. Casting about for some source of revenue to equalise its income with its expenditure, the Government of India resolved to impose a duty on all foreign goods taken into the country. The claim was put forward to absolve a district and an industry in England from those duties. Upon that principle I should like to ask Englishmen, who have conquered India, who have held India by force, what possible justification can be alleged for an exemption in favour of a particular class of English produce? Such a claim amounts to this—and it is nothing unless it amounts to this—that in the government of India we are to look not exclusively, not even primarily, to the interests of the Indian people, but that we are to subordinate these interests to the conditions of those who command votes in this country. I say that to concede such a doctrine as that is to strike at the very roots of the system on which you can justify the maintenance of our rule in India. (Cheers.)"

"This, you would suppose (Mr. Asquith continued), is not a party question. What happened? An eminent leader of the Unionist party—Sir Henry James—moved the adjournment of the House of Commons in order that he might put forward on behalf of his constituents this preferential claim. I do not know that we ought to complain of his conduct in that respect, for he may very reasonably have thought that he was bound in the first instance to look after the interests of his constituents; but what was the attitude of the Unionist party? This was treated by them as a party question, and they seized it as an opportunity for turning the Government out of office. They summoned their rank and file together in order that they might succeed in their design. I am glad to say that that design was completely and ignominiously frustrated. My right hon. friend Mr. Fowler shattered their claim, and showed that if granted it would be disastrous to India and disgraceful to England. (Cheers.) I have asked what was the conduct of the Unionist party. One or two of their leaders, to their credit at least, Mr. Goschen and Mr. Courtney, broke loose and took the side of the empire. As to the rank and file, the great mass of them, and still more as to the leaders, history will record that upon this, the most crucial and critical occasion, they voted against the Government, and subordinated the interests of India to the exigencies of party, or took refuge in obscure places." (Cheers and laughter.)

The Imperial Institute, such is its dignity, was engaged at the beginning of March in a quarrel with the Assessment Committee of the parish of St. Mary Abbott, Kensington, on the question of rating. Opinions may differ as to the value of the Imperial Institute, but its friends and admirers will hardly be pleased to learn, on the authority of a witness called to support its claim, that "the site might be used, for instance, for the erection of large blocks of flats, or perhaps for a big telephonic or electrical establishment, such as might be erected in the future." *Sic transit gloria!*

Mr. G. N. Curzon, M.P., who has actually accepted the medal of the Balloon Society, delivered the other day a lecture to that "scientific" body on "My Travels and the Results." "England's fate," he said, "was linked with India. England could no more exist without India than India could exist without England." Yet, when questions as to the expense of the civil and military departments in India are under discussion, it is common for the opponents of Indian claims to argue that England derives no benefit whatever from her association with India. Those who make this statement will have to reckon in future with Mr. G. N. Curzon, M.P.

The *Statist* says that the Indian Budget is more satisfactory than at one time looked at all likely. The year ending with March, 1894, closed with an actual deficit of 15,470,000 rupees; but if we exclude 10,610,000 rupees expended on railways under Famine Insurance the deficit is reduced to less than five million rupees. The revised estimates for the year just closing show a surplus of 9,900,000 rupees. The expenditure has been reduced below the Budget Estimates, while the revenue has increased satisfactorily. The new taxation, we are told, yielded altogether somewhat more than three crores. The cotton duties alone gave 14½ million rupees, or very nearly as much as all the other new Customs duties, which gave 16¼ million rupees. The final result is an estimated surplus of rather more than 4½ million rupees. With this prospect the Famine Insurance is to remain in abeyance.

LAMAISM.

The Buddhism of Tibet: or Lamaism, with its Mystic Cults, Symbolism, and Mythology, and in its relation to Indian Buddhism. By L. Austine Waddell, M.B., F.L.S., F.R.G.S., etc., etc. London: W. H. Allen and Co., Limited, 1895.

The veil which had screened the Buddhism of Tibet is now raised by the scholarly work which Surgeon-Major Waddell has just published. The fragmentary accounts which had hitherto reached Europe created the impression that the religion of Tibet was a corrupt form of Buddhism, and that the explanation of its manifold peculiarities was to be found in distorted evolutions from the originally simple doctrines of that ancient faith. In order to gain full and accurate knowledge it was necessary for some European scholar to learn the Tibetan language, to penetrate into the country, to win the confidence of the Lamas, and to devote some years of his life to collecting facts and recording the orthodox traditions relative to them. This useful work has been done by Mr. Waddell, and the result is a book full of original matter, which clears from the subject the mists and inconsistencies in which it has been so long enveloped, and presents the whole, notwithstanding its irrational absurdities, as the natural outcome of the circumstances which gave it birth.

Lamaism, to speak strictly, is not Buddhism at all, although it was founded in A.D. 747, by Padmasambhava, a member of the degenerate school of Tantrika Yogacharyas, who were at the time established in Afghanistan, Kashmir, and Swat. The Tantrika school, as is well known, arose from a debased form of Hinduism, which associated, in a curious compound, magic and the female principle in creation with the exalted ideas of primitive Buddhism.

Tibet was at that time in a condition of absolute barbarism, having no spiritual notions beyond devil-worship and sorcery, and no ritual beyond devil-dances intended to gratify the malignant spirits which, in the apprehension of the Tibetans, peopled earth, air, and water. To appease the anger of these demons human sacrifices were offered, and even cannibalism was practised. The king of this people, having heard of Buddhism from accidental association with China, sent to India for an expositor of the faith, and received as a missionary the remarkable mystic Padma-Sambhava. A man imbued with the magic and mysteries of the Yoga school in the corrupt form in which it prevailed in Kashmir at that period was not likely to take serious objection to the sorcery of Tibet, and, in fact, Padma-Sambhava seems to have done little more than to suppress the worst features of demonolatry, and to incorporate the less repulsive features with the quasi-Buddhistic Tantrik Yogaism which he took with him. The old unreformed Lamaism dating from his period clearly exhibits these characteristics. The thinnest veil of Buddhism is cast over demonolatry, associated with some ideas of a personal deity, and the medley is held together by laborious ritualism and priestcraft. After these ideas had prevailed for about 300 years a reformation was started by an Indian Buddhist monk, who enforced celibacy and high morality, and deprecated the general practice of diabolic arts. Several branch sects started from this reform, and when, in the fifteenth century, this reform was itself reformed it gradually spread over the whole of Tibet, and became the predominant form of Lamaism, as we now find it. Notwithstanding these reformations both Lamas and people are steeped in Pagan superstition and idolatry, every monastery maintains its sorcerer, and the people live in an atmosphere of the marvellous, in constant apprehension of malignant demons, to ward off the evil machinations of which they resort to charms, exorcisms, and almost ceaseless repetitions of prayers, bribes, and liturgical ceremonies. Certainly the unhappy Tibetans are the most priest-ridden people in the world, and cannot eat, drink, sleep, awake, sow, reap, buy, sell, travel, or even mend their clothes, except under the influence of omens and auguries, and the ministrations needed to ward off the anticipations of dire portents. Such is the so-called Buddhism of Tibet, and it is evident that it has no claim to that name, beyond the fact that Buddha and his disciples are known in the land, and extravagant perversions of some of his doctrines are current. Lamaism is the proper term for this corrupt but interesting form of belief.

Mr. Waddell, after recounting the history of the creed, discusses the doctrines and the monastic orders and hierarchy, and then describes the buildings, temples and shrines. The mythology and gods, their images, symbols and charms, are followed by a full account of the ritual, and astrological systems and necromantic performances, and the festivals and miracle plays in which the priests and the people indulge. Popular Lamaism is the theme of the closing essay in this valuable volume. There is no part of the book which does not contain much that is original and throw unexpected light on subjects hitherto not clearly understood. It is pleasant to observe the firmness with which the author separates the historical Buddha from the Buddha of mythology, and brings out the solid grains of truth which gave such astonishing vitality to his great reformation. The logical consistency which Mr. Waddell shows to have held together Buddha's theory of life proves what a grasp he has of the subject. The powerful influence which Buddha exerted over the people of his time and succeeding ages up to the present is conclusive evidence that he appealed to the reason of his hearers and to the feelings of humanity at large. Buddha is in no way responsible for the mysticism and superstition which ultimately disfigured his doctrines on pure morality and rational philosophy. The chapters on the initiation of monks, their course of instruction, examinations, ordination, duties, and discipline, are interesting on account of the fulness with which the subjects are treated. The masses, orisons, and vespers, and the more important ritualistic celebrations are described with much minuteness, translations of many of the prayers themselves being given. The specimens of divination and the method of constructing a horoscope are novel and interesting, and the process for foretelling states in future births by means of dice and a peculiar board seems to indicate that the Lamas are not above cheating in order to stimulate expensive rites for the purpose of saving the inquirer from an undesirable fate. The book is richly illustrated with pictures of the saints and all the paraphernalia of worship, the dresses and implements of the Lamas, scenes from the plays and devil-dances, the charms and astrological apparatus, and everything needed to depict the large number of novel subjects introduced into the narrative. A copious bibliography is supplied, and an index has been added to complete the value of the book.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of India cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to India (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with India, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of India can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., Trinity Street, Cambridge; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

India presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, APRIL, 1895.

THE DEBATE ON THE COTTON DUTIES.

By Herbert W. Paul, M.P.

An old Parliamentary hand, who has sat for a quarter of a century in the House of Commons, told me that he had never in all his experience seen such a collapse as the failure of Sir Henry James's attack on the Government for imposing the cotton duties. The belief that Ministers would be defeated was general, and was shared by both sides. Sir Henry James explained, after the enterprise which he led had broken down, that he had simply acted as a Lancashire member who felt it his duty to bring forward a Lancashire grievance. Sir Henry's statement of his own views and intentions is, of course, conclusive. But it cannot alter the fact that a summons of unusual urgency was issued to the Conservative party who attended in unusual numbers. That they came to give votes, and not solely to hear speeches, no rational being can doubt. If the Opposition had held together, and the Liberals from Lancashire had joined them, a simple sum in arithmetic will easily prove that the Government must have been beaten. The Opposition did not hold together, and with three or four exceptions the Lancashire Liberals voted against the motion of Sir Henry James. The result was a majority for the Government of 195. If anyone had predicted such an event the previous day he would have been set down as little better than a lunatic, and he might have obtained, among sporting politicians, almost any odds against it. What was it that effected this extraordinary change? I say without hesitation that it was the speech made by the Secretary of State for India. Although I have the highest personal admiration for Mr. Fowler, my political prejudices are not likely to be in his favour. As is well known, he absolutely refused to carry out the Resolution of the House of Commons, which I had the honour to move, in favour of examining the natives of India at home. But I am bound to say that, setting Mr. Gladstone aside, I never heard an abler or a more convincing speech in my life than Mr. Fowler made on that occasion. It ought to do great good in India. For it was delivered on behalf of the Indian people, it saved them from a cruel wrong, and it vindicated before the world the justice of British rule. Mr. Fowler's final appeal to the House of Commons as the repository of a sacred trust, and as morally representing the politically unrepresented natives of India, was worthy of Burke. When he sat down the battle was over.

I will not enter into a technical discussion of twists and hanks, of twenties and twenty-fours. But when an Indian journalist calls Mr. Fowler the Secretary of State for Lancashire, he shows a complete ignorance of things as they are. No British Administration, however powerful, could venture to approve of a protective tax. Without the countervailing excise the cotton duties could not have been revived, no matter what the financial condition of India might be. And I will tell the readers of India why. We Free Traders believe that Protection in any form is bad for all countries at all times. We should not, therefore, regard a protective duty as raising a question between India and Lancashire, but as equally injurious to both, and if possible worse for the country in whose alleged interests it was sanctioned. Let me give one practical illustration of what I mean. These cotton duties will not last for ever. If they had had the effect of artificially fostering a native industry, which could not have grown up without them, their removal by destroying that industry would have been the cause of ruin and disaster. By insisting upon the excise, against which so much was said in the Viceroy's Council, Mr. Fowler was serving India, and not Lancashire. But I hope that the debate and the division will go far to disabuse the Indian mind of the idea that Lancashire cares only for herself. The Lancashire members who habitually support Lord Rosebery's Government were placed in a difficult position. But when it came to the point nearly all of them went with the majority. They knew by that time that the Government was perfectly safe, and that they might vote as they pleased without the slightest danger of a Ministerial crisis. Yet they risked their seats rather than imperil the financial stability of India. Lancashire has been hard hit. Many of her looms are idle. The profits of her manufacturers are small. Interested persons have been spreading, for their own purposes, the absurd doctrine that duties on imports are paid by the producer, not, as the fact is, by the consumer, and asking why Lancashire should supply an Indian deficit. The Lancashire vote ought to convince our Indian fellow subjects that there is no real antagonism between the two great centres of the cotton trade in the British Empire. It is the natives of India who pay the duty, and not the manufacturers represented by Sir Henry James.

The conduct of the Opposition ought not to pass unnoticed in India. The Conservatives and the Liberal Unionists were strongly tempted to take the opportunity of turning the Government out. All Oppositions desire that end, and the present Opposition believe, rightly or wrongly, that if there were an appeal to the country now, they would win. Their leaders set them a bad example. Lord Salisbury, who has been twice Secretary for India, authorised Lord George Hamilton to say in the debate that he was against the re-imposition of the cotton duties, notwithstanding the necessities of Indian finance. Mr. Balfour, who is a Lancashire member, was ill. But he must be presumed to have approved of the "five-lined whip" which is only issued to the Opposition when a serious assault upon the Ministry is contemplated. Mr. Chamberlain, though in the House when the division was called, evaded the rules by declining to vote. The views of the Duke of Devonshire, a former Secretary for India, were not disclosed. Mr. Goschen loyally and patriotically supported the Government. But Mr. Goschen is not a leader, and Lord George Hamilton, speaking as the mouthpiece of Lord Salisbury, refused to follow him. The rank and file of the party, however, declined to be misled. They would not make the welfare of India a question of party, and thus they saved their own chiefs from discredit. I hope it will be recognised in India that, with the strange exception of Sir Richard Temple, all which is honourable and distinguished in the Conservative ranks voted for the stability of Indian revenue, and the justice of Indian administration. As it turned out, the Government would have avoided actual defeat, even if their opponents had polled their last man. But nobody knew that beforehand, because nobody knew how the Lancashire Liberals would go. It is often said that speeches in the House of Commons never change votes. That is not true. In my brief parliamentary experience I have known many instances to the contrary. But it is very rare indeed, so rare as to be almost unknown, for a speech to change votes in a formal struggle between opposing parties to determine the fate of the Government of the day. That feat Mr. Fowler achieved, and for achieving it, in the actual circumstances of the case, he deserves the gratitude of everyone who cares for the solvency of India.

Herbert Paul.

THE INDIAN PROBLEM:
SIR LEPEL GRIFFIN'S GUESSES THEREON.

I.—By "A Tartar."

Sterne said that when a man had a mind to preach, any text would serve—even one much more concise than the humourist suggested, "Phrygia, Cappadocia, etc." Sir Lepel Griffin having, as is the way with him, "a mind to preach," did so at the Westminster Palace Hotel on the first of the Ember days in March; and he hit upon a text, which, being a model of brevity, should have a soul of some sort in it. "India in 1895" was the text: and, as the year was scarcely well begun, the audience was bound to surmise that it must indicate a prophetic soul. And yet those who have assessed the oration of the eloquent Punjabi from the *Times* report will be fain to murmur in the words of the old saw, "what is new in it is not true, and what is true is not new." It is only just to Sir Lepel Griffin to note that he modestly confessed the subject was "too vast for one paper;" but as he went on to unfold his "few words on some of the most pressing questions affecting the relations between this country and India" one was reminded of the octopus with its hundred-and-one prehensile arms. If fate decreed that one should at once deal with these pressing questions, the whole number of this magazine would be consumed in the attempt; for it is not permitted to me, as it is to the quondam enthroner of princes, to dispose of such complicated matters by way of showy rhetoric or scornful epigram. To anticipate—some such feeling seems to have been shared by the noble Duke who presided. Although, as a former Secretary of State for India, he had some solid substratum of knowledge to go upon, the brilliant oration had evidently been too much for him. His Grace, after remarking that the lecture "contained much matter for serious reflection," went on in plain prose to remind his hearers that, as the transfer of India from Company to Crown had not—as he and others expected at the time—induced Parliament to give more continuous attention to Indian affairs than formerly, it was more than ever desirable that the British public at large, with whom final responsibility rests, should be instructed on pressing Indian questions gradually, and not left at the mercy of hasty decisions in the time of some great crisis. And it may be admitted that while Sir Lepel Griffin's "few words" covered half the earth from, St. Petersburg by way of the Pamirs even unto Pekin, and expanded into many purple patches, his lecture might also be taken as a free challenge to men of light and leading to bestow some of their best thought, before it may be too late, on the problem of how to reconcile our insular and class interests with the durable welfare of India itself. Stated in this way, which is really the impracticable method on which our official classes and conventional publicists are proceeding up to the present, the problem is an irreconcilable one.

That Sir Lepel Griffin only swims in that hopeless method is obvious from his retailing such misleading half-truths as this, for instance: "In my view, this country reaps, as compared with India, little benefit from the connection." Let him consult J. S. Mill, Walter Bagehot, and other authorities on international statics. He may then perceive the enormous material "benefit" that the United Kingdom derives, generation after generation, from the millions and millions of "tribute," which—though not demanded by decree as did Rome from subject provinces—does as really enrich this master country, and, by the same operation, diminishes the resources and starves the industrial progress of the subject country over which we hold unchecked sway and inexorable control. Then as to the "benefit" of political power and prestige; let him compare notes with some mature Continental or American publicist, and he may then come to realise the enormous advantage that England derives from holding India in the hollow of its hand. This power is grand; and, no doubt it is handsomely used; but this is only one side of the shield. It is a great thing to preserve internal peace in that great continental peninsula, and to allow the masses of its people—as in the last thirty years or so—to enjoy that quiet and social order to which, by their traditions and institutions, they have always been inclined. But what is the cost of this outward peace under our "scientific" and alien rule? Sir Lepel, in his superficial treatment of this economic question, took occasion to flout the authority on this subject of the one Indian representative in our Parliament; and he went out of his way to gibe at the Parsis because they find something better to do on behalf of their country and the State than to go soldiering. The test of the revenue and fiscal policy of any Government is—what does it leave to the people? Without going into the details of that comparison here, it is sufficient for those who care to estimate the value of the lecturer's generalities to refer them to the careful statement by the said Indian representative during the debate on the Address (see *Supplement* to India for March). It was there shown, that, taking the very lowest rate of net taxation per head in India, that amounts to at least twice the percentage paid here; that is when the relative income per head is taken into account, which is obviously the only true standard of comparison. Here, in passing—though the correct figures do not much concern orators such as the one under notice—it should be observed that these averages of taxation, repeated without comment in each "Explanatory Memorandum," only supply the mere nucleus of the comparison. It is true that there the land revenue figures are also given; but many authorities hold that the land assessments cut into the very quick of the cultivator's returns, sweeping off every fragment of surplus or economic rent. Therefore, that large item being included makes the burden nearly double; and especially so if the costs of collection are also added, which are just as much a charge on the subject as is the figure of net taxation. But this is not all. When nearly one-third of a country's revenue has to be sent out of it, the pressure on the population and diminution in return from its industries become accentuated to an extent of which sciolists like Sir Lepel Griffin have no conception; only competent economists can realise this, though the unhappy patients wither under the consequent atrophy.

Coming to the more generalised question as to the deficient subsistence of the masses of the Indian peoples, Sir Lepel Griffin has quite an easy mind. In his airy way he said that he "had never met with the one-fifth of the population alleged to be on the verge of destitution." That may be so. His experience as a district officer was very limited. Thanks to his nimble wits, the larger part of his not very prolonged Indian career was spent in Secretarial and Political service, neither of which offers favourable opportunities for observing and studying the actual condition of the people. But better authorities have come to very different conclusions bearing on this proposition. There is Lord Lawrence's testimony before the Select Committee of 1872-3 to begin with. Earl Mayo was constrained to a similar conclusion as to the chronic poverty of Indian masses. When put in the form of money estimate of the total production, *pro capite*, as in Mr. Dadabhai's elaborate calculations, founded, be it noted, mainly on the statistics of the prosperous Punjab, this dismal fact as to income, liberally estimated at Rs. 27, was proved to demonstration. The India Office, with all the experts at its disposal, failed to secure any refutation. Sir Evelyn Baring, when Finance Minister, found himself forced to accept that pitiful estimate. Sir William Hunter also admitted that some forty millions go through life with insufficient food; though he has since sought to qualify that admission, but with indifferent success. Then what about the inquiry promoted by confidential circular at the Marquis of Dufferin's instance? Sir David Barbour knows more about the result of that specially improvised industrial census than he has yet deemed it meet to publish. Then, in spite of Sir Lepel's pious hope based on future results of irrigation and other remedial measures—of which hope we desire to make the very most—he cannot be unaware of the awful fact that since 1840 there are authentic records of over twelve millions of souls in India having perished from famine. As to comparison between poverty in England and India, Sir Lepel trotted out Sir Richard Temple's favourite hobby; and we admit it may be less painful to perish from starvation under "sunshine" than in frost. But what does "sunshine" mean, when the the firmament is as brass and the earth is iron to rayats and landless labourers, when their exportable products have been sacrificed in the payment of revenue with usury or chronic indebtedness, and the attenuated peasantry have but the tenderest stores of millet, wild fruits or roots left for subsistence? We are loth to dwell on this painful subject; but, when pensioned and prosperous officials try to blind the eyes of the British public with rhetorical dust, the hard facts must be stated. That is essential in any efforts towards remedy. As to Sir Lepel's tempting programme of possible future extension of fiscal devices, we have all been over that well-trodden ground. Then as to sumptuary taxation on marriages and tobacco, or peddling with petroleum, it will be sufficient to consult practical Indian financiers such as Sir John Strachey or Sir Auckland Colvin regarding heroic schemes of "recasting" fiscal policy. One remark may be made on this amateur financier's fascinating sketch of the Grand Mogul's alleged omniverous revenue list—which reminds one of Sydney Smith's famous passage on the much taxed Englishman of our grandfathers' time. All that happened a long time ago; and, be it noted, whatever the Delhi drag-net brought in, it all remained in the country.

In respect of the one dominating cause of India's present financial and political difficulty the "clever superficial" lecturer excelled himself. In his best volatile and frivolous fashion was the assertion that "not a rupee too much has been spent on the defence of the frontier"—a statement which has no more weight than that of the breath with which it was uttered. Similar to it in vanity was the audacious begging of the whole question of the revolutionary policy pursued since 1876 in the bald assertion that "these wars (the Burmese and frontier wars) were for the benefit of India." As to that term, "frontier wars," so effectually has the British public been misled through the *Times* and Reuter that it was safe, with the mostly complacent audience before him, that he as one of the promoters of those systematic and deliberate aggressions, should speak of the "frontier." That huge pretence has been exposed again and again in these columns; but the time is coming when our too confiding and, in this particular, ignorant public men must be made to understand that those "military operations," in Beluchistan included, have all been "carried on *beyond* the external frontiers of Her Majesty's Indian possessions." It is childish to talk about "the benefit of India" when scores of millions of its revenues, credit, and resources, have been worse than wasted in the barren hills of Afghanistan and the mountains of high Asia. The only certain result of such blind and reckless policy will be the squandering of still more of unhappy and helpless India's scant resources, as at this moment is going on in Waziristan, and in the Hindu Kush where a whole army corps is to be sent to put down a brigand chief, whom, three or four years ago, the Simla schemers were inciting to worry and bully "our ally" the Amír of Afghanistan. How futile and what clap-trap it is to declaim about "cheese-paring economists," when it is just that profligate and illegal expenditure, far beyond the confines of India, that is driving our Provincial governors and active Indian administrators to their wits' end. They have to cut down productive and conserving outlay in every direction, starving public works, cramping education, sanitation, and every social need of the people—all in consequence of the inexorable demands of the Simla political and military cormorants.

The only excuse for that ruinous and wicked policy is the monstrous delusion as to the probability of a Russian invasion of India. But Sir Lepel Griffin now tells us that he "has never been a Russophobe," and that he "does not believe that a Russian invasion would commend itself to any sane statesman." What a pity it is he has dissembled this tardy manifestation of good sense so long! He must have been smiling in his sleeve while so often abetting the secret but all powerful supporters of that fatal and monstrous delusion. Let us welcome this glimpse in him of returning sanity; which also showed itself in his incidental protest against the unspeakably foolish scheme to entice H.H. Abdur Ráhman from Kabul to Windsor. After all, Sir Lepel must have a lucky star somewhere in his horoscope. Hence his being deputed at the critical moment to negotiate with Abdur Ráhman and his Sirdars at that terrible crisis about Christmas, 1879, for the extrication of General Roberts and his forces—just saved by General Donald Stewart—from their almost hopeless beleaguerment in or about Kabul. For the political significance of these events let my readers look at Mr. Dacosta's little book, "Our Scientific Frontier" (W. H. Allen and Co., 1891), more especially chapters vi and vii, pp. 73-88, and pp. 108-112, founded on Mr. Hensman's, Dr. Duke's, and other indelible records of the period.

Here one must leave the brilliant but mischievous manifesto with which the East India Association seems to have entered on some new departure. If this policy should induce even the two extremes of dukes and *flaneurs* to catch up Indian questions anyhow, even such random treatment may not entirely run to waste. But as to this lion from the Punjab, who at one time gave promise of roaring reasonably, should he not now be warned to give heed to his ways? Let him leave "high falutin'" about India to Sir Richard Temple, Mr. H. H. Fowler, and aristocratic globe-trotters. Let him be content with his laurels as a Political, although there may be a few seared and blighted leaves amongst the wreath; but he should leave to more patient geniuses and wiser heads such commonplace matters as fiscal policy past and present; the regulations required for a "free press" (including the Anglo-Indian portion thereof); and simultaneous examinations, which, as this latest Daniel-come-to-judgment tells us, "would be subversive of all our best traditions"—whatever these may be. The mention of this topic reminds me of an ancient saw and modern allegory. One of the gleams of white light in course of Sir Lepel Griffin's mostly iridescent lecture was a line in which he expressed confidence alike in the equity and safety of open competition (though only performed in London) as the gateway for the Indian Civil Service, it being free to our citizens from all parts of the vast Empire, even Bengal included. And yet excellent as is this competitive system, are we not, after all, reminded that nothing in this sublunary sphere is perfect, seeing that it was by the wide sweeping net of competition that Sir Lepel Griffin was brought into the Indian Civil Service, and thereby India caught

A Tartar.

II.—By Jnanen N. Ray,

Joint Secretary of the Pan-Indian Association.

In a letter to the *Daily Chronicle*, dated March 6th, I have already protested[1] against the character of a meeting of the East India Association, held under the Chairmanship of the Duke of Devonshire, at which Sir Lepel Griffin read a paper upon "India in 1895." There was not an Indian present at the meeting, with the exception of Mr. Bhownaggree, but felt himself insulted by Sir Lepel's misrepresentations. I am unfortunate enough not to be able to agree with anything that Sir Lepel said, not even with his opinion that Parsis had better hold their tongues. By Parsis Sir Lepel too obviously means one of them—the most representative Indian, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. Few know as well as I do the enthusiasm that there is among Indians—Hindus and Muhammadans alike—for this honest old man. We know him to be the straightest plant in the grove. Where is a countryman of mine who has not unquestioned trust in him, and would not follow his leadership? Though it is only expressly to the Parsis that Sir Lepel denies any status, he implies a denial of it to all Indians in India. Not only no Parsi, but no Indian, may speak. He would be glad to see the newspaper press gagged, and the "noisy agitators" silenced. Seriously, Indians can have no right in India. If I am not mistaken, it was Sir L. Griffin who once suggested that India should be rapidly colonised by Englishmen, and the work should begin with Kashmir. Perhaps he still cherishes the idea.

The only remarkable feature of Sir L Griffin's paper was the multitude of the subjects upon which it touched. The questions stand so far apart from each other that it is impossible to criticise the paper as a whole. I can only select for consideration the most important of the questions. Sir L. Griffin, of course, wishes India to be left entirely to the India Civil Service. The sympathetic interest evinced by a handful of Englishmen in the House of Commons or outside it in Indian affairs he regards as a mischievous thing. In his sober opinion, they are mere "faddists," and some of them are more so as they actually listen to what Indians have to say. After all, who knows India better than an Indian civilian, even though, during the five-and-twenty years he does his duty, he never succeeds in speaking or writing any of the Indian dialects, and is never seen but in the ante-room by the Indian gentry and noblemen? The truth is that incapacity in these men to sympathise with Indian life constitutes a serious danger to the relations between England and India. It is a happy thing both for England and India that there are some "faddists." Sir L. Griffin looks upon the proposal for simultaneous examinations as fraught with the greatest perils, for he has to confess that at copy-book learning the Indians are really clever. If, therefore, the resolution of the House of Commons is ever put into effect, anything may happen. His own idea is, if possible, to bar Indians from the Service altogether. Failing that, the present difficulties ought to be perpetuated, and even accentuated. Sir Lepel, it would seem, has a new version of an old proverb: all is fair in love, war, and in the government of India. Indians must come to England. It is interesting to note the various phases through which the insistence on this method has passed. First, it was argued that Indian education was superficial, and consequently inadequate as a mental equipment for a man who had to fill, in due course, the highest posts in the land. But we do not hear much of this argument now. It has been discovered, as Sir Alfred Croft, the Director of Public Instruction in Bengal, recently said to an interviewer, that one meets not seldom with Indian students who are thorough in what they know, and have proved themselves capable of high scholarship. Again, it has been urged that Indians who are desirous of Indian Civil Service appointments must come to England in order to form their characters. It is much easier for them to lose their characters than to form them in England—far removed from the influence of family life, and the checks of social and public opinion. Recollecting a passage of a magazine article of Sir L. Griffin's, poetically named "The Lotus Eaters," I am inclined to think that he, at least, would not lay stress on the necessity of Indians coming to England for character. For in that article he pays an unqualified compliment to our moral qualities. Perhaps he paid it by mistake, or perhaps it was to suit his purpose of protesting against the proposed abolition of the highly lucrative opium traffic as an uncalled-for interference with the habits of a pattern moral people. But now it is put forward, and Sir L. Griffin is the father of the suggestion, that Indian candidates for the Indian Civil Service must come to England, not for education, nor for formation of moral character, but in order to learn Imperialism and something else. I should have thought that India was a better place to learn Imperialism, doing or suffering. The other something I presume to be the use of arms. For, as Sir L. Griffin says, when the hour of danger comes, where would the copy-books be? Then must you draw the sword, and shoulder your gun. This is news. I never knew that civilians were soldiers ever. Nor do I find it in history that they were much good in 1857. If anything, they were an impediment in the way of regimental soldiers. Still, they were a different class of men altogether from the present class of civilians. If only for the fun of seeing these men fight, I should like to witness some performance. Sir Lepel knows as well as I do—or if he does not let me refer him to the Appendix of the Annual Civil Service Books—that, because of their status in social England, by far the largest number of them know no more about the use of the gun than the volunteer or the cockney who has once in his life, possibly on a Bank holiday, shot a chained dog.

In the nature of things the civilian censor cannot countenance the idea of any form of representation in Indian political affairs. For with its introduction the paladin expires, and the pro-Consul sinks into a mere signatory to the Crown. I believe that Sir

---

[1] Since the publication of my letter I am glad to say that the East India Association gave us a fair opportunity of discussing Sir Lepel Griffin's views. But Sir Lepel Griffin was not present.

L. Griffin thinks the Indian Councils Act a grievous mistake. But he does not say so. He prefers to make the three assertions that representative institutions are a doubtful blessing, that Indians do not want them, and moreover, that they will never be fit for them. The first of these propositions is a piece of cheap political philosophy, generally professed by undergraduates and by members of junior Conservative Clubs. If representative institutions are a doubtful blessing, are they more doubtful than a rank bureaucracy? And how does Sir L. Griffin know that Indians do not want representation? I was not aware that he was in our confidence. I trust, however, that the public will know what lies behind Sir Lepel's assumed spokesmanship for Indians. If we do not want representative institutions, we do not want a representative in Sir L. Griffin. For the real representatives of India—accredited public men and the press—Sir L. Griffin has nothing but scorn. He characterises the one as a set of noisy agitators and the others as scurrilous and seditious. There is not an Indian politician nor an Indian journalist but Sir L. Griffin regards him as a man to whom a foolish Government has given a free education in order to make him an enemy. What does Sir Lepel mean by free education? There is no such thing as free education in India, and in the Government colleges a student has to pay higher tuition fees than either at Oxford or Cambridge. And is not the third assertion a little too bold? I hope it is not impertinence to say that Sir L. Griffin is not a prophet. He has neither foresight nor insight. I believe that no country, not even England with her "hundreds" and "shire-motes," has had a better start for a full realisation of the principle of representation than India. The principle of representation has always been embodied in her village communities. Sir L. Griffin thinks that India has never been used to representative institutions, but that all Governments before her present Government were but the unoiled machinery of despotism. Now, to take the Muhammadan rule only, it was not so ugly as it is painted. At least it left us in vital integrity the village communities, in which the real government of India has always lain, and which Mr. Elphinstone—observant student that he was—justly compares to "little republics." The fault of Muhammadan rule was rather in lack of governing, as the fault of the present rule is in excess of governing. If, instead of those organic factors—the village communities—despotism had been the fact in India, Sir Charles Metcalfe well points out that Indian society, in the face of so many foreign invasions, could never have retained its present solidarity. But Sir L. Griffin asserts that the local self-governments and the municipalities in India have been more or less a failure and a scandal. Not even a considerable number of the class whose interests Sir L. Griffin champions agree with him here. But what constitutes a failure, and where is the scandal? Have local self-governments and the municipalities in India had a fair trial yet? How long is it since they were established? Sir L. Griffin should be more explicit. I am aware that there have been a few cases, fugitive enough, where not quite fair means have been resorted to. But does that prove that local self-government and the municipalities should be forthwith abandoned? Sir Lepel knows something of the history of Parliamentary government in England before 1832. May I remind him that it was found necessary to pass the Ballot Act so lately as 1872—after the time at which he first left England for India? It is not fair to judge local governing bodies in India at their worst and ignore them at their best.

As for the state of taxation and the financial difficulties of India Sir L. Griffin believes that bimetallism is the only remedy. The question of bimetallism is as bad as a metaphysical problem. There are very few men who understand it in all its bearings. I think that Sir L. Griffin is not one of them. Perhaps he is one of the persons lately discovered by the gallant member for Oxford, who do not understand bimetallism and yet believe in it. A remedy, I should think, must be inferred from the cause of the evil. Sir L. Griffin would imply that the Government of India is prostrate because of the decreasing rate of exchange. But the real cause lies elsewhere—in the extravagance of the Government. The present deficit is due to the dual policy of so-called internal development on one hand, and lavish waste of money on the other—on the frontiers, in wars and preparations for wars. Had it not been for this, the Government of India, as there has been no great war and no great famine within the last ten years, could out of its present revenue deal with any fluctuations in the value of silver which we have known or may reasonably expect to know. At best, bimetallism only promises a few more years of the career of the Anglo-Indian prodigal. It will enable him to pay the Home Charges without immediately running into more gold-debt, and without exciting so much clamour.

Not bimetallism, but retrenchment, is the only thorough remedy. And if the Government does not cut down its expenses, not even the purse of Fortunatus will save it from ultimate bankruptcy, even though Mr. Fowler continues to be the Secretary of State. Sir L. Griffin does not see any waste, not even in such an item as the building expenses, out of the Indian revenues, of a lunatic asylum at Woking, nor in that highly equitable grant, the "exchange compensation allowance." He regrets that the Indian Civil Service, the best paid Service in the world, is not better paid than it is. Sir L. Griffin asserts that a second-class tradesman is better off. If it is so, and if money is so great a consideration, why do not Sir Lepel and his friends stick to second-class trade? Let not hirelings at least boast of laying down their lives for the Empire.

Until bimetallism arrives, in gold and silver pomp, Sir L. Griffin proposes to meet the present deficit by fresh taxation. He holds that India is not overtaxed, that there is ample room for further taxation, as Indians are not poor. He ought to know, but unfortunately so ought Mr. Fowler—always the apt pupil of the India Council. What does Mr. Fowler say? In his speech on Sir H. James's motion, one of the reasons he gave for the cotton duties was that there was no room for further taxation in India. Not long before that Mr. Balfour, in a speech at

Manchester, had said exactly the same thing. Or let me refer Sir L. Griffin to Sir Evelyn Baring (now Lord Cromer), who in his Budget speech in 1882 said that not only was more taxation not possible, but even if it were possible it would be unjustifiable. Have matters improved since 1882? On the contrary, they have gone worse Taxation has been a progressive curse in India. Since 1885 alone more than four millions of fresh taxation have been imposed. Where, consequently, an Englishman pays in taxes six or seven per cent. of an annual average income of £35, an Indian has to pay fourteen to sixteen per cent. of an annual average income of little over £1. And this is not over-taxation!

Sir L. Griffin is all on the side of the "scientific frontier." He and his class, like so many Macbeths, are always looking out for some evil disaster—retribution. The words "hour of danger" seem to haunt them. They make a little too much of it. I do not deny, though I am no Russophobist, that there is a distinct possibility of danger. There are elements of it, which if they are not guarded against, may end in the greatest catastrophe ever known. The first and foremost of them is official superciliousness and ignorance; the second, want of sufficient control on the part of the House of Commons over the Government of India; and, thirdly, the extreme poverty of the mass of Indians. Indian politicians whom Sir Lepel calls noisy agitators have all along fostered and encouraged amongst the masses almost a blind belief in the generosity and the sense of justice of the English people. If these politicians fail to prove that they have been in the right, I do not care to say what must inevitably happen. Sir Lepel and his friends believing, or pretending to believe, the educated and better-off classes in India to be disaffected lay only a flattering unction to their souls. For if there is disaffection, it is really among the masses. It is they who suffer the most, having iron in their flesh, and hunger in their stomach. And hunger will have the better of everything in the long run. Some of the aspirations of the educated Indian you may laugh at as whining sentiments without doing yourselves serious injury. But it is well to remember that hunger is not a sentiment. It is more than I can explain why, while Englishmen are brewing danger of their own policy, through want of sympathy, extravagance, and over-taxation in the interior, they should only be anxious about the danger on the frontier. Sir Lepel wants to maintain the scientific frontier at any cost. But it is just possible it will cost too much.

Jnanen N. Ray.

ARBITRARY POWER AND FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION.

By J. Dacosta.

Every week brings accounts from India showing how rapidly the administration of that country is declining, while the authorities are bent on devising additional taxation and on concealing the state of things from the public at home. Arbitrary power is being resorted to for these purposes without regard to law, and the very Acts of Parliament which constitute the Government of India are deliberately violated for attaining those ends. Meanwhile panegyrists, relying on the common tendency of the human mind to accept flattering statements unquestioned and to turn away from views which disturb pleasing visions, are industriously displaying delusive pictures of the state of things in India.

While the general public at home is thus kept ignorant of the danger which threatens our great dependency, the peril is doubtless clearly perceived by all who, unbiassed by party politics or personal interests likely to obscure their conclusions, have sought information on the subject with ordinary diligence. For them it is no secret that illegal practices of the Executive in India are not only condoned but actively supported by law courts presided over by Government servants, acting and deciding in servile obedience to the orders of their superiors. The Civil Service of India, which has hitherto been coveted by Englishmen as an honourable career fairly remunerated, is in danger of being demoralised; and the following observation recorded in its special organ reveals the feelings which its members now entertain on the subject:

> "Seeing the disregard of the elementary forms of justice, it might be said that it is the policy of our rulers to emphasise the lesson that a person taking service under the Indian Government forfeits the ordinary rights of an Englishman."—*Pioneer*, November 25th, 1894.

The extent to which the country is suffering under these deplorable conditions is not only reflected in the Indian press throughout the empire, but can no longer be concealed even in the cautiously compiled reports of the officials, as will be seen from the following statements published in the *Pioneer* of the 12th October last:

> "The latest Administration Report of the Madras Police is simply terrible reading. Grave crimes such as murder, dacoity, robbery, and cattle-theft have all increased. Of sixty-three cases in the Kistna district only three detections resulted. In Arcot, where twenty-two cases were reported, one solitary detection was the result. Where false accusation is rampant, all confidence in the justice of the rulers is lost. In the Karnul district twenty-four per cent. of the cases sent up for trial by the police proved false. We do not believe that this record could be beaten in Russia. Nor is this a solitary instance, for in Madura no less than 2,238 persons were harassed on charges that were proved to be false. The murder record comes to 393, the largest for thirty years. When on comparison with previous years we note that, in every case, the increase in crime has been great, we cannot but feel that there is something very wrong indeed. Can anyone be blamed for thinking that, if the police service is any criterion to the general administration, matters must be sufficiently bad to need a searching and radical reform from without, since reform seems impossible from within."

The same paper writes on the 22nd December: "The Inspector-General's comments on the working of the police in the North-West Provinces, are certainly not complimentary"; and a similar state of things obtains in our other Indian provinces. In view of this increasing corruption in the police, the consternation of the people at the Government deciding to enlarge the powers and extend the operations of the Indian police becomes quite intelligible. Indeed, it might even be said that the internal policy of the Indian Government is sometimes prompted by vindictiveness and an increasing thirst for arbitrary power, and that its aim is to terrorise the people into a complete surrender of their rights and their property. The bearing of the authorities is certainly not that of administrators charged by a civilised and a Christian nation with the protection and welfare of industrious and law-abiding populations whom Providence placed under British rule. It partakes rather of the character of a foreign soldiery striving to secure the spoils of war.

Every British tribunal in India, excepting the four High Courts which were established by Parliament and whose original jurisdiction is confined to the Presidency towns, is now precluded from affording relief or redress in respect of wrongs inflicted by the Executive, and when the Police Bill is passed the scope for arbitrary proceedings will be further widened, as the people will then be restrained, by the fear of retribution which that measure is calculated to inspire, from appealing to the High Courts from the decisions of the tribunals of the Government.

The Police Bill, which the Viceroy's Legislative Council has been ordered to pass, empowers the Executive to levy a punitive police tax upon individuals in every district where the district officer deems it necessary, and to select those individuals upon information furnished by the police and the district officer himself. Ostensibly the tax is to be imposed on the inhabitants generally, and the secret information regarding personal characters and pecuniary means is to be used for exemptions. Thus the individuals selected for punishment are not to be informed of the accusation laid against them, or to have any opportunity of disproving it when it is false. Can a wider road be opened to bribery and and corruption, to favouritism and revenge? And the plea for this iniquitous measure is that peace and order can no longer be preserved in our Indian provinces by legal and fair modes of procedure! It is alarming, indeed, and most humiliating, to contemplate the depths to which our Indian administration is descending, through the exercise of irresponsible power.

> "To punish a man without giving him an opportunity of showing that he has not deserved punishment, has, in all ages, been held to be contrary to the first principles of natural justice. If the law cannot reach those who are accused of disturbing the peace, it is because evidence cannot be produced of their guilt."

These self-evident propositions occur in a memorial recently addressed to the Government against the Police Bill in question, by the European and Anglo-Indian Defence Association of Calcutta. After exposing the unprincipled and dangerous powers which the Bill vests in the district officer, the memorialists warn the Government that "the measure is calculated to work serious injustice, and is certain to cause much disaffection"—a warning of peculiar significance, looking at the words in which it is conveyed.

A careful consideration of all these circumstances can scarcely fail to bring home the conviction that thorough reform in the Indian administration can no longer be delayed with safety. Indeed such conviction has already been widely entertained, and perplexity seems to attach only to the question as to whence may reform be looked for. The authorities constitutionally empowered to introduce the needed reform are the Indian Secretary of State and the British Parliament, and neither evinces the intention of moving in the matter. The former has undertaken to propose a Select Committee to inquire into the expenditure of the Indian revenue, but stipulated for restrictions which, if they are insisted upon, must exclude from the inquiry some of the chief causes of the existing financial difficulties—among others, the inordinate increase in the military expenditure. Instead of a Select Committee, a Royal Commission, it is now said, will undertake the inquiry; but the change will not improve the prospect of reform, and it seems futile to seek suggestions for restoring equilibrium in the finances in an inquiry which is to leave out all items of expenditure involving questions of policy. For example, the propriety of charging the Indian Exchequer with the cost of wars carried on beyond the frontiers of India is, presumably, not to be questioned, because it relates to the foreign policy of the United Kingdom. At the same time the charge has involved the Indian Exchequer in most serious complications, and is moreover directly opposed to the intention of Parliament, as expressed in LV Act 106 of 1858, *for the better government of India*. On the same plea of excluding questions of policy the Commission might be prevented from inquiring into the expediency of maintaining Governors with costly staffs and establishments at Madras and Bombay when the conditions which rendered such appointments necessary have long ceased to exist, and when other provinces of equal or greater importance and extent are administered with equal efficiency and at less cost by Lieutenant-Governors.

Whatever the inquiry may eventually elicit, one fact is certain to be prominently brought forward by it, namely, that the revenue raised in India falls short of the expenditure of her Government—a conclusion which might, by specious reasoning, be turned to account for justifying a continuance of the dangerous practice of raising loans to cover annual deficits; and it might also serve to ground arguments in favour of a British guarantee for the debt of India. In these respects the inquiry might subserve purposes of the Government, but it is difficult to see how it can promote the cause of reform—the only object for which the inquiry was demanded. Were even the Commission to recommend measures of reform, how would their execution be secured?

Let us not forget that Parliament, by Acts passed in 1858 and 1861, established a deliberative legislature, provided for the maintenance of law and the due administration of justice, and enacted special clauses intended to protect the finances of India from being diverted from their legitimate purposes; and that those provisions have all proved of no avail because the Indian Secretary of State acquired, by the sacrifice of Indian finances, and other Indian interests, sufficient support in Parliament to disregard with impunity the statutes which contain those beneficial provisions. Patronage, customs tariff, public works, foreign policy, our feudatories, the army, the Court of Wards—all have furnished the Government of India with the means of acquiring

Parliamentary support, and what is to prevent the same course being pursued in the future, so long as the exercise of arbitrary power is unchecked?

It should be borne in mind that the Indian Secretary of State has no personal or permanent interest in the safety of the finances of India, and that, while his connection with India might be severed any day by a change in the British Ministry, he is permanently impelled by powerful interests—the interests of his political party—to use the finances placed under his control in supporting the Cabinet of which he is a member.

With the disastrous result before our eyes, of the experiment of allowing the finances of India to be controlled by a member of the British Cabinet, to persist in maintaining that vicious system is to oppose reform and to court disaster. India's great need is that her finances should be protected against the exactions of political parties at home, and such protection she obviously cannot get so long as her finances are controlled by a member of a body whose very existence depends on the goodwill of the political parties in question. The first step towards reform, therefore, must be the creation of an influence to be exercised over the administration of the finances by a body deeply and permanently interested in their safety and in the welfare of the country—conditions which the Indian Secretary of State manifestly does not fulfil.

While reform is thus urgently needed, it is a matter for surprise as well as for regret that no practical suggestion on the subject comes from any quarter. The question concerns deeply not only the Indian people but the public at home likewise; for there are not many families in the United Kingdom without friends or relatives or important interests in India, and these would all grievously suffer were any serious disaster to happen again in that country. There seems every reason to apprehend that the following words of the historian of our troubles of 1857 may once more find their application in our situation in India:

> "We were lapping and lulling ourselves in a false security. We had warnings many and significant, but we brushed them away with a movement of impatience and contempt."

J. Dacosta.

SIR R. GARTH ON THE CONGRESS.

CRUSHING REPLY TO SIR G. CHESNEY.

"*Of all the many acts of injustice which have marked the conduct of the Government of India of late years, there is none in my opinion which can at all compare with their insolent treatment of the Indian National Congress. There is no subject, I consider, upon which the English press and the English public have been so cruelly and persistently misled by the Government party.*"

The current number of the *Law Magazine and Review*—the publication of which has, we regret to learn, been delayed by the illness and subsequent death of the editor, Mr. C. H. E. Carmichael—contains a remarkable article by the Right Hon. Sir Richard Garth, M.A., Q.C., late Chief Justice in Bengal, upon "India as it is, and as it might be." We refer in "Indiana" to the general scope and contents of the article, and reproduce below the most essential passages of Sir Richard Garth's brilliant and unhesitating defence of the Indian National Congress. Sir Richard Garth writes:

Of all the many acts of injustice which have marked the conduct of the Government of India of late years, there is none in my opinion which can at all compare with their insolent treatment of the Indian National Congress. There is no subject, I consider, upon which the English press and the English public have been so cruelly and persistently misled by the Government party.

SIR G. CHESNEY'S ATTACK.

As an illustration of the sort of spirit which animates them against the Congress, I would refer to an article written by Sir George Chesney, K.C.B., in the *Nineteenth Century* for June last.

Sir George Chesney, I need hardly say, is an Indian officer of high position. He has spent the better part of his life in the service of the Government, and he was a member of the Viceregal Council from 1886 to 1891.

He is, moreover, well known as the author of a work styled "Indian Polity," which has just gone through a third edition in the press. He is a staunch supporter of the Government of India, and we may therefore, I presume, accept what he says in the article to which I have alluded, as being substantially in accordance with Government views and principles.

ITS "SPIRIT OF INTOLERANCE."

If any of my readers have not seen that article, I invite them to read it. It illustrates very forcibly the spirit of intolerance to which I have alluded, and I can hardly conceive anything more calculated to wound the feelings and excite the disaffection of a people keenly sensitive to ridicule and insult, than the tone and language in which they are spoken of in that article.

He describes the Indian people generally as absolutely unfit for free institutions; and if I understand him rightly, he would wish to deprive them, if he could, of those three great blessings, which we are taught to regard as the very elements of freedom—a free Press, a free Bar, and the right of publicly discussing their political views and opinions.

But his attacks are more particularly directed against the "Indian National Congress." He holds it up in most contemptuous language to the ridicule and obloquy of the English people. He speaks of it as "*a class outside and apart from the people of India, properly so-called; a body made up of pleaders in the Law Courts, ex-students from Government Colleges, and the class which works the Native Press.*" He derides their proceedings, insults their chairmen, and winds up by saying: "*In fact the holders of these Congresses are a set of inept blundering political charlatans. They have never made one useful or practical suggestion, but their proceedings, when not merely silly, are undoubtedly mischievous.*"

AS STRONG A TORY AS SIR G. CHESNEY.

Now I think I ought to say, before I proceed further, that so far as I am personally concerned, I am at least as strong a Tory as Sir George Chesney himself. I mention this, not because I am weak enough to suppose that anybody cares at all what my political views may be, but merely to satisfy my readers, if I can, before I come to deal with the pith of my subject, that I am not at all likely to take too Radical a view of the Indian situation, or to espouse the cause of the people against the Government, except for some very good reason. I went out to India in 1875, believing, as most Englishmen do, that our Government there was a model of paternal rule, and

I was most unwilling to come to any other conclusion, until the truth forced itself upon me with a weight which it was impossible to resist.

COMPOSITION AND AIMS OF THE CONGRESS.

Having said thus much, I will now deal with what seems to be the principal object of Sir George Chesney's attacks, namely, the National Congress, and I consider:

First, who the gentlemen are who compose the Congress: and,

Secondly, what they have done to deserve Sir George Chesney's obloquy and insults.

1st. The Indian National Congress is a large, influential, and important assembly of earnest and patriotic gentlemen, who, since 1885, have at the close of each year met at one or other of the large centres in India, such as Calcutta, Madras, or Bombay, to discuss their political views and opinions.

They consist of delegates from every part of India, who are duly elected at a number of divisional headquarters. We are told that, at the Congress meeting in Allahabad, in the year 1888, fully three millions of men took a direct part in the election of these delegates, who themselves numbered no fewer than 1248. The constitution of this important body was thoroughly representative; it consisted of Princes, Rajas, Nawabs, 54 members of noble families, Members of Council, honorary magistrates, chairmen and commissioners of municipalities, Fellows of Universities, members of Local Boards, and professional men, such as engineers, merchants, bankers, journalists, landed proprietors, shopkeepers, clergymen, priests, Professors of Colleges, Zemindars and others.

I should also say that they were thoroughly representative as regards religion, as well as their rank and profession.

The Hindus, of various castes, numbered ..	964
The Muhammadans	222
The Christians	38
The Jains	11

Thus we see how utterly unfounded is the statement made by Sir George Chesney that the Congress is largely made up "*of pleaders in the Law Courts, of ex-students from the Government Colleges, and the class which works the Native Press.*"

So far as Bengal is concerned, I know it to be untrue. I am personally acquainted with several of these gentlemen. They have often been guests at my own house. I have met them constantly in the best native society in Calcutta, at Government House Levées, and at Government House parties: and I should think that Sir George Chesney, although he may not have known them personally, must frequently have met them there himself.

ITS MEMBERS NOT "AN ISOLATED CLASS."

It is also utterly untrue that they are, as Sir George Chesney would suggest, *an isolated class.* They are no more isolated than the members of the Carlton or the Reform or any other Club in London; and I may also say that I know many native gentlemen of high rank and position, who, although thoroughly favourable to its views, have been deterred from taking as direct and open a part in the Congress proceedings as they would have wished to do, by the determined jealous hostility which the Government have manifested towards the movement.

2nd. And now, secondly, let us see what these gentlemen have done to deserve Sir George Chesney's invective.

He says that they are "*a set of inept blundering political charlatans; that they have never made one useful or practical suggestion, and that their proceedings, when not merely silly, are undoubtedly mischievous.*" This is the language in which the member for Oxford, a General in Her Majesty's Army, and K.C.B., thinks fit to insult these gentlemen, who were only lately under his rule as one of the members of the Viceregal Council; and now, what have they done to deserve this choice invective?

THEIR COURAGE AND PATRIOTISM.

I will tell you what they have done. They have dared to think for themselves; and not only for themselves, but for the millions of poor ignorant people who compose our Indian Empire. They have been content to sacrifice their own interests, and to brave the displeasure of Government, in order to lend a helping hand to those poor people.

They have had the courage and the patriotism to denounce abuses, which have disgraced our Indian rule for years past; which have been condemned by public opinion in India and in England, and to which the Indian Government appear to cling with a tenacity which seems utterly inexplicable. They have dared to propose reforms which, despite the resistance of the Government, have been approved by Parliament, and to endeavour to stay that fearful amount of extravagance, which has been going on in India for years past, and has been the means, as some of our best and wisest counsellors consider, of bringing our Eastern Empire to the verge of bankruptcy.

This is what these good men have done to deserve the taunts and insults of the member for Oxford city, and the relentless persecution of the Government of India.

And now, as to their never having made one useful or practical suggestion, and as to their proceedings, when not merely silly, being undoubtedly mischievous, I am afraid Sir George Chesney must be a little oblivious.

THE INDIAN COUNCILS ACT.

What does he say to the Indian Councils Act of 1892? That was a reform, I take leave to say, entirely due to the strenuous exertions of the Congress. It was proposed and carried at their very first meeting in 1885. They pressed it in vain upon the attention of the Government year after year, until at last Mr. Gladstone yielded to their urgent solicitations by passing the Act of 1892.

It certainly is rather amusing under these circumstances, to find Sir George Chesney, in the last edition of his "Indian Polity," actually modest enough to attempt to take credit to the Government of India for passing this measure, which they had been steadily resisting as long as they could, and which they were only obliged to take in hand at last, for the purpose of *defeating*, as far as possible, the more liberal intentions of Parliament.

As regards the Viceregal Council, I am sorry to say they have succeeded in reducing the intended reform almost to a dead letter. The Government still have entirely their own way in the Council, and their officials are forced to vote for them, whether they will or no. Only witness the lamentable scene which occurred the other day at Calcutta on the question of the cotton duties, when the whole of the non-official members voted against the Government, and some of the official members would have done the same, had they not been forced, like so many dummies, to obey the orders of the Secretary of State. What a mockery to call this a Legislative Council!

SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

Look again at the resolution so strongly urged by the Congress from the very first in favour of the separation of executive and judicial functions. It is almost impossible to conceive the injustice that has been worked in India by uniting these powers in the same official. The Government know this perfectly well; the Courts of Justice have urged it over and over again; the whole of the non-official community in India abhors the present system; and I am happy to say that after a long struggle on the part of the Congress two successive Secretaries of State (Lord Cross and Lord Kimberley) have, in the House of Lords, admitted its iniquity. But the Government still clings to the abuse.

Then, again, look at the following resolutions of Congress:—

1. Against the enormously increasing military expenditure, which Sir Auckland Colvin considers, in common with thousands of other good men, as the main cause of India's distress.

2. In favour of reform in the Police Administration, which, indeed, is most sorely needed.

3. In favour of a Legislative Council for the Punjab.

4. In favour of allowing prisoners in warrant cases to be tried (if they wish it) at the Sessions.

5. In favour of Lord Northbrook's motion in the House of Lords, for a strict inquiry into the Home charges.

6. In favour of appointing barristers instead of civilians to some of the district judgeships.

7. In favour of the establishment of military colleges in India; a resolution which, we were given to understand, was favourably considered by the Duke of Connaught.

I do not enlarge upon these resolutions, because the English public would hardly understand their merits; but speaking for myself, I entirely approve them; and they have also been approved by thousands of well-informed, educated gentlemen, who, I take leave to say, with all respect to Sir George Chesney, know quite as much about their merits as Government officers.

I quite admit there are other resolutions with which I disagree as strongly as Sir George Chesney; as, for instance, the one in favour of simultaneous examinations in England and India for the Civil Service. If that were carried out, the English element in the service would be inevitably swamped in a very few years; and it would be absolutely impossible to carry on British rule in India without a competent staff of British officials to work it.

But at the same time it seems hardly respectful to call the Congress leaders a set of "*inept political charlatans*," merely because they pass a resolution which a majority in the House of Commons thinks proper to approve.

THE POVERTY OF THE MASSES.

Sir George also, I see, finds fault with the Congress because in dealing with the poverty of the masses he imagines that they have lost sight of the fact that the Government has spent upwards of thirty millions of money during the last few years in trying to cope with this difficulty. But here again he is mistaken. The Congress are only too mindful of these facts, and well they may be; because *it is their money and the money of their fellow-countrymen* which has been spent in this way; and they think, and so, I believe, do the great mass of intelligent people in India, that a large proportion of it has been utterly wasted, and that it might have been far more profitably applied in other ways if the people (through the Provincial Councils or otherwise) could have had some voice in its application.

CONFIDENCE AND CO-OPERATION *v.* DESPOTIC INTOLERANCE.

Now I wish to say further, in conclusion, with regard to the Congress, that I defy any man to find fault with the perfect loyalty and respect to Her Majesty and the Ruling Power, with which its proceedings are conducted. I have studied them from time to time very carefully; I have never seen a single instance of any disloyal sentiment or expression; and I invite Sir George Chesney or any one else to point out anything of the kind.

It seems to me that, so far from being in any way objectionable, the Congress affords an open, honest and loyal means of making the views and wishes of the most intelligent section of the Indian people known to the Government. We want no secret societies, no Nihilists or Socialists, either here or in India; and I firmly believe that, if the Congress or any similar institution had existed in India in the year 1857, we should never have experienced the horrors of the Indian Mutiny.

If our rulers in India, instead of trying to balance themselves on a dangerous pinnacle of despotic intolerance, would only descend to a safer level, and invite the confidence and co-operation of the people, I believe that they would find the task of government far easier in India than Lord Rosebery and his colleagues find it in the United Kingdom.

Reviews.

HINDU CIVILISATION.

"*A History of Hindu Civilisation during British Rule.*" By Pramatha Nath Bose, B.Sc. (Lond.), F.G.S., M.R.A.S., Officiating Superintendent, Geological Survey of India. In four volumes: Vols. I and II. Calcutta: W. Newman and Co. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co.

The excellent idea of which the execution is partially exhibited in these two handy volumes has long possessed the mind of the author. It grew out of his investigations for the composition of an essay on Aryan Civilisation in India, which was submitted to the Oriental Congress some sixteen years ago, and gained a prize awarded by the Italian Government. The incubation of the idea during all those years has rounded it to a satisfactory completeness. On points here and there, to be sure, a fuller statement or a larger authority may seem desirable; but, in the main, the author has laboured diligently to present an adequate picture of the varied conditions of his extensive subject. He has the great advantage of treating the matters with inside knowledge, and his scientific training has materially helped to give value to his exposition. He writes with simplicity and clearness. His work cannot fail to be extremely serviceable to all who wish to understand the conditions of Indian life, and especially to English students of the great problems of modern Indian development.

The first volume is devoted to the Religious Condition of the Hindus. The second volume deals with the Socio-Religious, Social, and Industrial Conditions. The remaining two volumes will discuss the Intellectual Condition, which is indeed the most important of all, viewed as a test of civilisation, and in its influence upon the other conditions. There is no separate treatment of the Moral Condition, it will be observed. The importance of this factor, however, is not overlooked. It is, of course, essentially involved in the other divisions, mainly in the history of the socio-religious and social conditions. Mr. Bose sketches each of the sets of conditions in historical development, more or less fully, but his main purpose is to trace the changes that may fairly be attributed to the influence of the Western contact. At the same time he is quite alive to the interaction of the different conditions in the actual life of the people. The religious condition of any people cannot be taken as in itself a sure criterion of civilisation, but it is nevertheless an element of the highest consideration. Its influences are not always easy to trace. In an examination of Hindu civilisation, however, it is especially necessary to take careful account of Hindu religion, for with the Hindus spiritual progress has always been the end and aim of life. The Hindu, as Mr. Bose points out, "has sought to subordinate the animal to the spiritual wants of life. He has sought happiness by self-denial rather than by self-indulgence, by curtailing the wants of life rather than by increasing them, by suppressing desires rather than by gratifying them, by lowering the standard of material comfort rather than by raising it." In not a few ways this tendency has its drawbacks, but it is, no doubt, one of the elements of Hindu feeling that militate against Christian missionaries, modest as their ways of life may seem to themselves and their countrymen. Over the Hindu the religious idea is sovereign. Hence the profound influence of the Yogis upon him, even in the most utterly practical things of conduct. Hence the bestowal of his wealth, if he be wealthy, in building temples and guest-houses, in digging wells and tanks, and in forwarding like works of social benefit. "Even now, after nearly a century of contact with an essentially material civilisation like the Western, the inherited spirituality of the Hindu is manifested in the recent reaction in favour of what may be called rationalistic Hinduism and other religious movements." Not only has the dominant spirituality of the Hindu nature led to deplorable neglect of the material interests of the people; it even submerged the feeling of patriotism, which has only recently been stirred into incipient activity by English influences. It is the peaceful disposition fostered by a spiritual civilisation that is the principal stay of the English domination.

Mr. Bose sketches the history of Hinduism from the earliest times. It is not necessary to follow him through his lucid exposition of the Vedic, Buddhist-Hindu, and Puranic periods, or even his more extended treatment of Neo-Hinduism and recent Hindu sects (especially the Brahma Samaj). We are rather interested to see his estimate of British influence. Mr. Bose enumerates, with historical details, the cruel religious rites that have been from time to time suppressed by the English Government—human sacrifice, infanticide, self-immolation, self-inflicted tortures, and hook-swinging—the most serious of which were never very prevalent. Incomparably more influential has been the indirect influence of the English environment, exerted chiefly through the English schools. "This influence has been principally in the same direction as the influence of the Muhammadan environment—viz., in the direction of Monotheism and social equality." To English influence also is largely attributable the developments of Neo-Hinduism and of some of the recent sects. Mr. Bose includes Theosophy in his survey, restricting himself carefully to facts, and concluding that the imposture, "in India at least, is already on the decline." As to the Christian influences, "the character of the founders of the British Empire as a body was such as was not likely to inspire respect for their religion;" but "a far better class of Englishmen now come to India." "The missionary," however, "is still not very popular in Anglo-Indian society," though "no hindrance is now offered to missionary work." Still, "Christianity has made but little impression upon Hinduism"; and, although about the middle of this century a good number of high-caste and educated Hindus embraced Christianity, this tendency "has been on the wane for some time past." Nor does Mr. Bose think that Christianity will ever win many converts among the Hindus. He gives his reasons: the Monotheistic and all-embracing character of Hinduism, the strictures and sanctions of the caste system, and the lack of asceticism in the missionaries.

The elements of the socio-religious condition treated by Mr. Bose are caste, marriage customs, Sati, forbidden food and drink, and sea-voyage. In allegiance to the results of literary investigation, Mr. Bose at once declares that "the Rigveda shows beyond the shadow of a doubt that until towards the very close of the Rigveda period the Indo-Aryans were strangers to any kind of caste distinctions among themselves." He traces the growth and development of the system in clear outlines. The English influence on caste has been indirect, but great.

> "It has been chiefly exerted indirectly through the numerous schools where English is taught, through railways and steamers and offices and factories. The slow and imperceptible, but continuous and incessant, denudation effected by such agencies as rain-water, wind, and frost, destroys and levels down land more efficiently than violent but occasional floods and storms. And the slow but continuous operation of the educational agencies set to work by the British in India has done more to to weaken the foundation of caste within the last half century than the occasional outburst of reformative energy within the last twenty-five centuries."

English influence has acted as a powerful solvent of caste restrictions in respect of food, drink, and sea-voyage, but it has scarcely yet penetrated to the restrictions about marriage. "There are even Bráhmans and Christians who look upon intercaste marriage with disfavour." Mr. Bose writes dispassionately of widow-marriage, the treatment of widows generally, child-marriage, polygamy, and of the beneficial English influence in each case. The interest in Sati has happily become historical only. The section on the social condition of the Hindus discusses the position of women, the joint family, amusements of all sorts, and a miscellany of matters such as food, drink, clothing, tobacco, ornaments, furniture and conveyances. "It must not be supposed," says Mr. Bose, "that the zenana is felt as a hardship by the ladies themselves. They live in a world of their own and find as much happiness in it as falls to the lot of average humanity." The judgment is a man's, and it is not delivered from a quite independent standpoint, nor yet from a basis of scientific solidity. Still, the Western environment tends to a considerable relaxation of the rigidity of the female seclusion, though undoubtedly "there is still a strong body of conservative Hindus who look upon progress such as we have just indicated with disfavour." The joint family is a doomed institution, though the Western influence has not as yet largely advanced its disintegration. The final section, on the industrial condition, receives a full and well-balanced, though by no means exhaustive, treatment. The whole survey will be found to be lucid, proportionable, and unprejudiced, and to be especially serviceable to those who are unable to study the conditions of Hindu life and history in deeper detail.

THE GOSPEL OF BUDDHA.

The Gospel of Buddha According to Old Records. Told by Paul Carus. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company.

It is impossible to regard this work without profound respect. It is nothing else than an attempt to show the world its true Gospel. The author's deep earnestness, his pleading sympathy, his desire that no human suffering should escape him, and the lofty truths which make up the greater part of his teaching, give this work a place among efforts which claim and must obtain the tribute of reverence. The materials for the evangel which he so appealingly urges, he thinks he finds in translations of the Buddhist canon. But some of the passages are "rendered rather freely in order to make them intelligible to the present generation." The "most important" are "literally copied from the translations," but the book "takes an ideal position upon which all true Buddhists may stand as upon common ground," and this "arrangement into harmonious and systematic form," of what the author then deems to be the "Gospel of Buddha," is the main original feature of the work. There are also "explanatory additions," which are offered as elucidations of the main principles of Buddhism.

The doctrines on which Buddhists may agree are not necessarily all on which they do agree, and those on which living Buddhists agree with each other may contain tenets in which the first Buddhists would not agree with them. As a matter of fact, Mr. Carus's presentation of Buddhism leaves out beliefs which appear to be found in almost every country where Buddhism is now professed. That present Buddhism is not all confined to the Buddhism of Buddha, that some of his fundamental teachings have been departed from, that important changes which have been undergone by it have exerted a lofty influence not only on the many but on the few, are facts which cannot be passed over in an estimate of the worth of Buddha's own teaching. Mr. Carus, however, leaves these changes almost entirely aside, and sets forth as doctrines mainly those which he believes to have been taught by the founder. Obviously, also, much depends on the question whether the "free renderings," the "explanatory additions," and the interpretation of terms give accurate expositions of Buddha's doctrines. We shall find that Mr. Carus is not able to re-offer in its entirety, or in its foundations, the true "Gospel of Buddha," that he adds, by way of explanation, statements not found in his original authorities, and that some of the renderings change the essential meaning of passages.

That heaven is within; that there is a peace which passeth understanding, that it is attainable by all, rich and poor, noble and pariah; that the way to it is not power or talent, but knowledge of truth, the upright, self-denying and pure heart, lowly charity, and a universal love "grown great beyond measure"; that conduct is the all in all, that we really live only in good or bad deeds, that right holds all men in an awful grasp, whatever changes they may pass through, however long they may continue to exist; that all our acts will bless or curse generations yet unborn; that here on earth the true deliverance may be found; that righteousness is to be loved for itself; that even joys of heaven may be selfishly sought,—these are the teachings that give power to Buddhism and to which the ethic of this volume owes all its force. Even the metaphysical doctrines of Buddhism are not so absurd as they may easily be made to seem. In its chief philosophical conceptions, it expresses ideas held by scientists of our own day, and beliefs which, if those scientists refuse to affirm, they yet do not undertake to deny. The assertion that we have no knowledge of an ego is, of course, a leading proposition in much modern psychology. The denial of a Supreme Personal Being is not unknown in England. The tracing of all existence to Force or Power, and no further, is characteristic of the works of one of the best known writers. When Buddhists say that though an individual dies, his cleaving for existence does not die with him, but remains a power which must produce another being, believers in the conservation of force cannot well find reason for objecting, though they may call the force by another name and otherwise describe it. And, again, the familiar truth that the force of men's acts continues after them, and brings good and evil to their successors, is the essential part of the doctrine of Karma. It is a truth which adds inexpressibly to the importance of life and supplies motives of transcendent nobleness. Of itself it would be sufficient, if elevated to its right place, to transform society to an extraordinary degree. But these doctrines are not the whole of the Buddhism of Buddha. So far as they have been here given, they are none of them peculiar to it. If we would have the special characteristics of Buddhism, even as Mr. Carus gives it, we must add the Buddhist extensions and motives.

The fundamental thought of canonical Buddhism is that all existence is a cause of misery. The cleaving which produces existence is represented as evil and nothing but evil. Not to conquer this desire was to miss the one essential remedy for pain, for wrong-doing, and for all error. And, accordingly, the highest condition, Arahatship, is one which will actually put an end to any continuation at all of "the good man's life in any sense" (Rhys Davids). Even his moral force, his Karma, which might do good to those who come after him, and help to lighten the burden of the world, will itself cease with the Arahat's death. The reward of the highest state of goodness is represented to be that a chain of existences which might indefinitely increase goodness, should have its power of doing and transferring good brought completely to an end. You live well, with the result of not living. You achieve perfection to become wholly incapable of all goodness.

> "To the Arahat, O King, rebirth in every state has been cut off, all the four kinds of future existence have been destroyed, good and evil have ceased" (Questions of King Milinda, "Sacred Books of the East," vol. xxxv, p. 207).

> Upasiva asks respecting him who has been delivered by knowledge: "Will there be consciousness for such a one?" "As a flame," said Bhagavat, "goes out, cannot be reckoned (as existing), even so a Muni, delivered from name (*i.e.*, spirit) and body, disappears and cannot be reckoned (as existing). That by which they say he is, exists for him no longer." (Sutta-Nipata, "S. Bks." vol. x, pp. 198-99. The words in the first and third brackets are given in the translation.)

Not only consciousness *of* self, but consciousness *it*self was to cease. This result was to be looked for not as a gloomy destiny, to be faced with the Stoic fortitude, but as the highest of things to be aimed at. How could it not be so, if all existence brought suffering, and the extinction of suffering was to be sought by all Buddhists?

A real check to the paralysing influence of this prospect of destruction was afforded by the teaching that men, on the way, might become perfectly good, and do an incalculable work in lessening the sufferings and exalting the lives of their erring fellow-men. Still, the end for the very best was Pari-nirvana, the being extinguished. It was a characteristic of the Buddhas to postpone their own deliverance for the sake of others. But the inconsistency is plain. They put off the great consummation when they did this good to their fellow-creatures. The doctrine that all existence brought suffering was held to prove that all existence was to be got rid of, and the fact that suffering was suffering called forth a pity which kept men in existence. But the arriving at the condition in which doing good was impossible, and not the doing good itself, was the aim, after all. The Buddhist of Buddha's time did not believe in a supreme God, in a real, though undefinable, everywhere diffused, spiritual being or existence. The extinction, therefore, which destroyed mind and body, destroyed the cleaving to existence and Karma itself, was no re-absorbtion. Of this ending of existence Mr. Carus hardly says a word, if, indeed, he refers to it at all. He once speaks of extinction in relation to Buddha, but even there does not explain it. If Mr. Carus believed that sentient, intellectual, and moral existence will cease for every individual, and that we had better face the fact, even that would be a very different thing from bidding a man, though by means of righteousness, deliberately aim at that result.

All this logically followed from the facts that "suffering, the cause "of suffering, the cessation of suffering, the path "which leads to that cessation," were the four noble truths of Buddhism. When suffering was lost, the goal was reached, though the power of doing good was thereby lost also. The body was simply a home of corruption: "Merely as a sore, and without "cleaving to it, do the recluses (*i.e.*, the seekers after perfection) bear about the body (Questions of King Milinda, "Sacred Books" vol. xxxv, p. 115), the affections and all consciousness are causes of suffering. It was better not to be at all. Is this brave, or true teaching? The great deliverance was a deliverance from pain, and in the passage to it, individuality and goodness, selfishness and self must go by the board. It was the littleness of man, not his greatness, his misery and not his hopes and possibilities, that impelled the Buddhist benevolence and well-doing. Man was to be pitied on the ground that he is essentially a pitiful creature. And the love and righteousness of the perfect man, the blissful state of Nirvana, which he attains on the way, and which is *the* subject of praise in the Buddhist canon, have evidently to be understood in a way which is unexpected:

> "He (the perfect man) is not pleased or displeased with anything." "Appeased among the unappeased, he is indifferent, not embracing learning, while others acquire it." "He does not cling to good and evil," he has "left behind" both. (Sutta-Nipata, one of the canonical books of the Buddhists, vv. 813, 547, 520, vol. X., "Sacred Books.")

Very different, however, is the impression of Buddhism with respect to these points, that one derives from reading Mr. Carus's pages. A different impression, indeed, might be obtained from passages in the Buddhist canon. But explanations are there forthcoming, while the fact of ultimate non-existence, and the—what else can it be called?—apathetic quality which characterised Buddhist "charity" are altogether absent from the statements and descriptions given by Mr. Carus. He continually uses language which may suggest other teaching:

> "I proclaim the annihilation of egotism, of lust, of ill-will, of delusion. However, I do not proclaim the annihilation of forbearance, of love, of charity, and of truth."

Mr. Carus's original passage—he gives an extended table of reference—does not contain the second sentence. We will venture to say that it is not authorised, in its widest generality, by anything in the volume from which he quotes. The sentence is true, and that in the Buddhist sense, of the present life only.

> "He who harbours in his heart love of truth will live and not die."
>
> "The truth gives unto mortals the boon of immortality."

are "explanatory additions" of the writer's. Immortality is promised in the Buddhist canon as a boon which may be obtained in the present world, but it was an immortality which was deemed consistent with a good man's ceasing to be. The very chapter of the Buddhist work from which the section which gives the first sentence is taken, glorifies the man who "has freed himself from the necessity of "being reborn into future existences," and, with the end of rebirth, existence also came to a stop.

> "Tell me, if there be no âtman (ego or soul), How can there be immortality? Our thoughts have gone when we have done thinking."

Buddha replied:

> "Our thinking is gone, but our thoughts continue. Reasoning ceases, but knowledge remains."

For this answer we are not referred to any passages in the canon. It is an "explanatory addition." Mr. Carus may have thought himself justified in inferring it, but the grounds for the inference we have been unable to discover. It cannot be that Mr. Carus is speaking of the series in which the Karma rebirth produces what is practically to the Buddhist a continued existence. For the Buddhist happy state was one which made rebirth impossible. Such a paragraph, then, as "That part of your soul which "cannot or will not develop into Buddha must "perish," does not rightly express the founder's teaching. Mr. Carus thus renders a leading passage:

> "The first noble truth is the existence of sorrow. Birth is sorrowful, growth is sorrowful, illness is sorrowful, and death is sorrowful. Sad it is to be joined with those that we do not love, and painful is the craving for that which cannot be obtained."

An important sentence has been left out: "Briefly, "the fivefold clinging to existence is suffering" (Mahavagga, I., 6–19). The fivefold clinging is "clinging to the five elements of existence" (translators, in note). So, too, in making a selection from the page of Mr. Rhys Davids to which a reference is also given, he has omitted to mention a state of sorrow the due explanation of which would have made a great difference. "Among the states which are full of suffering and sorrow are the five Skand- "has." They "include all the bodily and mental powers of man." That is, to be a man at all, since it is a condition full of suffering, and to have the wish to exist as a man, are conditions which receive Buddhism's deepest black mark. Would anyone infer this from Mr. Carus's paragraph? He goes on:

> "The cause of suffering is lust. . . . . The desire to live for the enjoyment of self intangles us in the net of sorrow."

Here again, essentially important parts are omitted. What the Mahavagga says is:

> "This is the noble truth of the cause of suffering: Thirst that leads to rebirth, accompanied by pleasure and lust, finding its delight here and there. (This thirst is threefold) namely, thirst for pleasure, thirst for existence, thirst for prosperity."

Again,

> "The third noble truth is the cessation of sorrow. He who conquers self will be free from lust. He no longer craves, and the flame of desire finds no material to feed upon. Thus it will be extinguished."

But the Mahavagga:

> "Suffering ceases with the complete cessation of this thirst (described above), a cessation which consists in the absence of every passion; with the abandoning of this thirst, with the doing away with it, with the deliverance from it, with the destruction of desire."

Mr. Carus has changed and truncated one of the cardinal sections of the Buddhist canon.

True, Mr. Carus repeats the Buddhist denial of a self, but even that he does not always do quite clearly. "There is," he says, "no separate ego- "soul outside or behind the thought of man." Buddha said more. He denied that there was in any way connected with the material, mental and moral nature of man, such a thing as soul. "He "who believes," adds Mr. Carus, "that the ego is a "distinct being has no correct conception of things." Buddha went much further. He said that the ego did not exist, in an individual, or in all individuals taken together.

The tenet employed to reconcile the doctrines of the non-existence of an ego and immortality, was the theory of Karma. The word is re-introduced by Mr. Carus. Buddha declared that the essence of a man's being was his moral action and its result. These made him what he was. If cleaving to existence brought him into being, Karma determined his form as a man. The identical Karma which he had at the end of a previous life reappeared in the next succeeding. This was the only identity that remained. How many of Mr. Carus's readers will clearly understand that all the other constituents of a man's being were held to be wholly dissolved at death, including even consciousness? Similar mental powers were reproduced in the reborn, but the new individual was "not the same." Yet because his Karma was identical, he was "not another." That right governs and cannot be eluded, was a lesson pressed with great power by the Buddhist doctrine of Karma. But why join this lesson to a philosophy which is so intrinsically confusing? Why recommend as the superior teaching one that, in urging morality, deletes the subject-being in whom morality can exist, substitutes another will, another consciousness, another individuality, and still pronounces the two beings to be essentially identical? And what does it matter what truth is presented to us, if consciousness, by which we know it, is itself misleading, the offspring and continuation of error?

As self-consciousness, and the belief that there was any self at all were deemed to be illusions, selfishness could be branded as devotion to a non-existent thing. This view is followed by Mr. Carus. "If this self were a reality, how could there "be an escape from self-hood,"—a term which includes selfishness. But if it were not, how could there be unselfishness? We are to believe in acts which are without an agent, in thoughts which are without a thinker. Then, what do thoughts think? Themselves? If so, the thoughts are thinkers under another name. In early Buddhism, we must accept metaphysics which make the ethics unthinkable, contrary to fact and self-destructive. We must take an aim for our efforts which ultimately renders effort worthless. We must admire a view of life we condemn as unmanly, and lower our conception of goodness itself.

And how came the author to make the astounding statement that Buddha "bases his religion solely "upon man's knowledge of the nature of things, "upon provable truth"? Is the dissolution of mind and sentiency and individuality at death, provable? Does the assertion that mentality can exist without a self, thoughts without a being to think them, stand on the same footing of certainty as that twice two is four? Did Buddha state a demonstrable truth when he said that men ought to aim at non-existence? Did he rely solely on "man's knowledge of the "nature of things" when he propounded the doctrine of Karma identity? The author has not declared the true "Gospel of Buddha." He makes for Buddha's teaching a claim which is not deserved, and presents us with ethics which, interpreted in the Buddhist sense, have been immeasurably surpassed.

THE NURSERIES OF CHOLERA.

The Nurseries of Cholera: Its Diffusion and its Extinction. An Address delivered before the Section of Public Medicine of the British Medical Associa- at Newcastle, August, 1893, with an Appendix on the International Cholera Convention of Paris, 1894, and on the Meccan Pilgrimage. By Ernest Hart, D.C.L. (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1894).

Mr. Ernest Hart's paper was read before the British Medical Society at a time when outbreaks on the Continent had brought questions as to the nature of cholera contagion and the prevention of the disease into great public prominence. His view is that cholera is endemic in certain parts of India, that it is transmitted thence chiefly by means of water-contagion, and therefore that communication is rendered easy by the frequent religious festivals in India at which bathing in some particular stream and drinking of its waters form an important part of the proceedings. The water is, he suggests, contaminated by the presence of some who have brought cholera with them from its home, and the disease spreads to countless numbers. Such a "fair" as is held every twelve years at Hardwar readily lends itself, Mr. Hart believes, to the dissemination of cholera, for the people are gathered from all parts of the country. The yearly pilgrimages to Mecca offer similar opportunities for the spread of cholera. In both cases the provision for the housing of the pilgrims is utterly inadequate, and in the latter case there is far more imminent danger to Europe. Mr. Hart observes that in 1891 certain sanitary precautions were taken in view of the Hardwar Fair. In particular the water supply was purified, and arrangements were made that it should be kept pure. Consequently, he argues, there was no outbreak of cholera. The few cases which occurred were speedily isolated, and the contagion did not spread. The case was clearly a triumph over the "providential" or "fatalistic" theory. But it does not prove that cholera is exclusively transmitted through the water-supply. This theory doubtless accounts for many apparent vagaries in outbreaks of cholera. Mr. Hart has referred to some of them in a recent article in the *Nineteenth Century*, and his theory harmonises with the English view that ordinary quarantine regulations are of no avail by comparison with the efficacy of a good sanitary system. But there are objections to Mr. Hart's theory which are overruled in a somewhat hasty manner. Surgeon-Colonel Hamilton, for example, opposes to the statement that cholera is a water-borne disease the fact that "cholera in India, certainly in the Bengal Presidency, always advances up stream." To this objection the curt response is: "Does he really think that 'water-borne cholera' means cholera that has got in at the top of a great river like the Ganges and is floating down stream like a boat or raft?" This is no answer to the objection, which surely means that if cholera were transmitted by the water supply the effect of an outbreak up the stream would be shown by an outbreak on the lower banks, that is, at places lower down on the same water-supply. If this is not found to be the case one would naturally look for some other cause than water-contamination. In view of the danger that threatens Europe from the Meccan pilgrimages Mr. Hart urges the European powers to co-operate and to require that efficient sanitation shall be enforced and adequate provision made for the reception of the pilgrims. The International Cholera Convention, held at Paris in 1894, adopted the same view, and its recommendations resulted in certain regulations (appended to Mr. Hart's pamphlet) with regard to pilgrim ships, requiring suitable medical attendants, a supply of pure water, and so forth. The question suggests itself—is it impossible to do anything to stamp out cholera in the region of the Lower Ganges, where it is alway endemic? There, in a moist soil and an unhealthy climate, the contagion breeds under the most favourable conditions. Can modern science do nothing to cut off this evil at its root and save India and the world from the ravages of a terrible disease?

The Calcutta correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed on March 24th: There is no fresh news from Chitral up to this morning. The news of the attack on Captain Ross's party which was received on Friday is considered very serious as indicating that Umra Khan means to fight. It is believed that the strength of the garrisons along the Gilghit line is as follows: At Mastuj Fort, which is a fairly strong position, 200 Kashmiri troops and 54 Sikhs; at Ghizi, on the Gilghit side of the Shandur Pass, 100 Kashmiris; and at Gupis, 140 Kashmiris. Colonel Kelly, with a portion of the 32nd Pioneers, is pressing on from Bunji through Gilghit. Everything is being done to complete the arrangements for the march of Major-General Sir R. C. Low's force. Public opinion here, while fully recognising that the Government is bound to make every effort to rescue Mr. Robertson, is inclined to blame the diplomacy which allowed him to get into such a critical position, and to hold that no intervention should have been attempted until the Chitralis had settled whom they desired as Mehtar.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MARCH, 1895.

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). "Education *v.* Superstition." Clarke, S. E. J., "India and its Women." Kirtane, D. V., "Indian Women as Wives and Widows." "Ratanbai: A Sketch of a Bombay School Girl's Home Life" (Serial).

Religious Review of Reviews. Challice, R., "Buddhism: Christ before Buddha."

Temple Bar. "An English Girl in India One Hundred Years Ago."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MARCH, 1895.

Innes, M'Leod, Lieut.-Gen. .... "Lucknow and Oude in the Mutiny." (A. D. Innes and Co.)	12s. 0d.
Kipling, Rudyard .... "The Phantom 'Rickshaw; and other stories." (Macmillan and Co.)	6s. 0d.
Kipling, Rudyard .... "Soldiers Three; The Story of the Gadsbys; In Black and White."	6s. 0d.
Jamieson, George .... "The Silver Question, etc." (Effingham Wilson.)......	0s. 6d.
Carstairs, R.......................... "Human Nature in Rural India." (Blackwood.)	6s. 0d.
Hart, Ernest, D.C.L. .... "The Medical Profession in India; Its Position and its Work." (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Co.)	2s. 6d.

Printed by A. Bonner, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 5. (NEW SERIES.)] MAY, 1895. [SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus" .. 129
Chitral: An Object Lesson 133
Rural India 134
Military Aggression and the Budget .. 135
OUR LONDON LETTER 136
THE VILLAGE COMMUNITY IN INDIA, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D. 139
SOME ASPECTS OF INDIAN FINANCE, by T. Lloyd .. 140
SIR C. DILKE ON INDIAN FINANCE 142
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects.. 144
THE FORWARD FRONTIER POLICY:
I.—Chitral Relieved: What Next? By Sir W. Wedderburn, Bt., M.P. 145
II.—Lord Roberts and Indian Frontier Defence, by J. Dacosta 147
III.—The Anglo-Russian Agreement and Chitral, by an Ex-Diplomatist 149
IV.—The Dark Shadow Behind Chitral, by an Anglo-Indian 150
V.—An Appeal to Lancashire 152
OPINIONS OF SOME EXPERTS:
(i) General Sir N. Chamberlain 154
(ii) General Lord Chelmsford 155
(iii) General Sir C. J. S. Gough 155
(iv) General Sir J. Adye 156
(v) "An Expert" 156
(vi) Major H. G. Raverty 158
SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS 158

Indiana.

A large part of the present issue of INDIA is devoted to the discussion of the ruinous "forward" policy which the recent war in Chitral has exemplified in so striking a fashion. I should like to direct special attention to the signed articles and the citations of opinion which are to be found in the later pages of this Review, and to the questions and answers contained in the Parliamentary report.

Mr. J. Dacosta, whose reply to Lord Roberts is printed on another page, writes:—A leading article in the *Times* of April 23rd contains the following sentences:—

> "If by going to Chitral we are to earn the undying hostility of every neighbouring tribe, then no doubt the cost and difficulties are alike formidable. But if, on the contrary, there are good reasons to believe that what has again and again happened elsewhere will happen here, and that these independent tribes may be organised and converted into wardens of the marches, the substantial objections to Lord Roberts's views fall to the ground."

The writer in the *Times* omits to say where such results have happened. The Afridis of the Khaiber and the Mahsud Waziris of the Gomal consented, it is true, to keep their passes open to trade and ordinary traffic under stipulated conditions; and a number of their *maliks* assured us, in consideration of liberal subsidies, of the feeling of admiration and attachment which they and their tribesmen entertained for the British Government. A more convincing proof of their fidelity to an infidel Power which is attempting to subjugate their co-religionists will, however, be needed to warrant the belief that those border tribes may be converted into wardens of the marches or, as Mr. Curzon said, "into an irregular frontier guard of the Indian Empire." The treatment we received at the hands of the Mahsud Waziris when we recently attempted to occupy their territory in the prosecution of our "forward policy," exposed clearly enough the folly of our relying upon money-bought professions and assurances, and there is absolutely no room to doubt that the Afridis are quite as ready as the Mahsud Waziris have shown themselves to resent the presence of British garrisons in their country.

A Bombay correspondent writes, under date March 30th:—To-day's local papers publish the lengthy explanation offered at the Viceregal Council on the 28th inst. by Lord Elgin touching the Chitral imbroglio. He goes into a long history of the acquisition of Chitral. The upshot of it all is that Chitral, under an old agreement with the Mahárájá of Kashmir in 1876, was taken as a vassalage of Kashmir, that the British gave a small subsidy in consideration of which the chieftain agreed to be an ally of the Indian Government, and that therefore the British are bound to protect Chitral from harm at the hands of the enemies of the Mehtar. This is the first time that such a statement has been made. When Gilghit was acquired, when Hunza and Nagar were forcibly seized, and when public criticism was strong against such acquisition, not a word was said of this so-called compact of 1876. My own belief is that this is simply a strained story of some haphazard arrangements arrived at with Kashmir by Lord Lytton's Government in anticipation, at the time, of the invasion of Afghanistan. This is now paraded as a permanent arrangement.

The fact is that the Foreign Office has the thread of the whole history of these border tribes and Khanates in its own hands. Viceroys may come and go. They know absolutely nothing of that history. Whenever important occasions arise, the Foreign Office prepares a *précis* of past relations and circumstances. It is prepared to show, (i) generally, that the Government of India has some imagined or distant claim, and (ii) that the British Indian Government is the aggrieved party—the injured martyr. The public are misled by these representations. Who can verify the so-called facts related by the Foreign Office? Do we ever hear the case of the other side? In the absence of the story of the tribes themselves, how can we place implicit reliance upon the version of the Government of India?

In the case of Chitral (my correspondent adds) we may depend upon it that the Viceroy has been tutored by the Foreign Office. The Foreign Office is the showman who pulls the strings of the puppet. The public should exercise its critical faculty and judge how far each statement of the *précis* is borne out by the facts. Who is going to do that? We never know the true history. When the Amír three years ago wrote out a manifesto and commented on certain facts prejudicial to him as they were represented in the official organs, the public became aware of the difference between the two versions. But the chiefs of all border tribes are not like the Amír. Otherwise we might know a great deal. When scepticism is shown, the India Office or the Foreign Office puts up some traveller or other who has travelled in the Khanates to corroborate the special narrative. For instance, there is Mr. Curzon, or Captain Younghusband. These travellers are simply *protegés* or friends of the Foreign Office. It is a wonder that our old friend Professor Arminius Vambéry is holding silence. Sir H. Rawlinson is dead, and the India Office may not have another redoubtable Russophobist ready for the occasion. The *Pioneer*, strange to say, is dead against the invasion of Chitral. Perhaps there is a split between it and the Foreign Office.

As will be seen from the reply given on April 4th to Mr. Samuel Smith's question in the House of Commons, Mr. Fowler has at length determined that a Royal Commission and not a Select Committee shall enquire into the expenditure of the Indian revenues. The terms of reference are not yet stated, but it is earnestly to be hoped that Mr. Fowler will perceive the wisdom of allowing due scope to the enquiries of the Commission. A mere investigation of the way in which the Finance Department does its work would not be very profitable to anybody.

At the time of writing, the Report of the Royal Commission on Opium has not yet been published, and discussion of the subject is therefore postponed to our next issue. Meantime, it is generally believed that the attention of Parliament will shortly be called to the attitude adopted towards the Commission by the authorities in India.

The articles which Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., contributed to the *Manchester Guardian* of April 3rd and 8th are an interesting addition to his recent speeches upon Indian affairs. He marvels "why everyone that can at all afford it and who can spare the time does not travel" to India. But English visitors to India should avoid some of the habits of Anglo-Indians:

> "I endorse the commentary made by a fellow-countryman upon Anglo-Indian habits: 'They eats and they drinks, and they drinks and they eats, and they dies, and then they writes home and says the climate killed them.'"

Mr. Webb does not appear to have been greatly attracted by Indian scenery, but he describes the archæological remains as surpassingly interesting:

> "Years would scarcely suffice for even their cursory examination. One can have no conception of what Indian civilisation has been, of what the Indian people are capable, until one has seen something of them. The Taj Mahal at Agra surpassed all my expectations. It is surpassingly beautiful. It has not the soul or the associations of the Parthenon, or the Colosseum, or our cathedrals, but it is surpassingly beautiful—as the face of a person we did not know might strike us as the most lovely face we had ever seen. It is perfect in itself and in its surroundings. I saw it thrice—by moonlight, in broad sunlight, through a thunderstorm—and I did not know in which aspect most to admire it. The inlaid marble palaces, the tombs, the pearl mosques, exceed anything of which we can form any conception."

As for vague charges against Hindu rites, Mr. Webb holds the prudent opinion that they should be eschewed.

> "However defective the Hindu and Muhammadan schemes of life may appear to us, they are the best known to millions, their spiritual support and mainstay. So far as I could judge, there is perhaps less individual breaking away from those schemes which appear best to them than there is with us; and in practice they allow worldly prosperity and personal convenience to interfere less with adherence to what they believe to be divine truth than we do. What disturbs us most—what appears to us most repugnant to high civilisation and enlightened advancement—is the position of women. Changes in these respects can come only through the people themselves, and especially through their women, who are the most conservative supporters of present customs. The caste systems bar all effectual progress. Surely it cannot be long before

those who now cling to them come to perceive their incompatibility with national strength and advancement."

Happily the perception of this fact has already, as the success of the social reform movement shows, begun to dawn upon India.

Mr. Webb writes, as he has always spoken, in the highest terms of the character of the Indian people. "If," he says, "patience and kindliness of disposition, if contentment under hard conditions of life, if happiness derived from little things are Christian virtues, they possess them in no small measure." Apparently trivial but really significant incidents bear witness to Indian honesty:

> "In one of the larger Indian cities I conversed with the agent of a sewing machine company who had had large European experience. His principal business was selling machines on monthly instalments. I asked him what he had found was the average percentage of bad debts in such business in the United Kingdom. He said about 10 per cent. And in India? About 1 per cent., and such bad debts were almost entirely amongst Europeans and Eurasians. 'Practically we have no bad debts amongst the natives. If it comes that they cannot pay instalments, they will give back the machines.'
>
> "When leaving Bombay I had occasion to buy a bag to hold odd parcels. At a Hindu shop I was shown one for 2½ rupees. I tried further for something better, returned (the proprietor, not the attendant, was then in) and said I would take the bag. 'I cannot let you have it,' said the man, 'there is a hole at the back!' And so there was—one about the size of half-a-crown, that I scarcely would have noticed.
>
> "In bazaars so crowded that it was with difficulty I made my way amongst the people were money-changers, with piles of coin laid out on open boards before them. Could money be so exposed with us?"

Readers of INDIA are familiar with Mr. Webb's opinions as to the need of a courteous and friendly demeanour on the part of Anglo-Indian officials, and his personal testimony as to the poverty and the misery of the mass of the Indian people. It is to be hoped that many Lancashire readers digested his timely exposition of the duty of the United Kingdom to India:

> "In return for peace, good order, honest administration, and a scheme of government generally beneficial, India has to suffer an immense annual drain of resources—military charges, retiring allowances, pensions—spent outside her shores. What we have to look to is that the salaries of Europeans in the Indian Civil Service are not unduly high; that Europeans do not occupy posts that might be held by natives; that the taxation, especially the military expenditure, is not excessive; that there is a fair allocation of charges as between India and the United Kingdom. These are the questions towards which the educated opinion of India is being more and more directed. On most of them, we must remember, the interest of the military and Anglo-Indian official classes is opposed to that of the natives of India. They cannot be unbiassed judges."

As to the need of popular representation for India Mr. Webb speaks with no uncertain sound:—

> "Mr. Fowler is without doubt able and conscientious. But few previous Indian Ministers ever appeared more inclined, whether he is himself aware of it or not, to be guided by officialdom. 'We are all members for India!' he exclaims. The Indian Budget is of as much importance to the people of India as our Budget is to us. If 'we are all members for India,' how come it that we do not show the same keen interest in it as we do in ours? The optimism that would salve our consciences regarding our duty to India by the platitude that 'we are all members for India' is the same optimism that opposed Parliamentary reform and that pretended to believe that a Parliament without Irish tenant farmers and Labour representatives was competent to do justice to Irish farmers and to the interests of the labouring classes."

Not less true are Mr. Webb's warnings that with a military class war is generally approved, that Englishmen should beware how they leave decisions regarding Indian frontier-wars mainly with military councils, and that taxation amounting (as in India) to 5 per cent. upon average incomes of less than 30s. is a heavier burden than taxation amounting (as in the United Kingdom) to 7½ per cent. upon average incomes of more than £30. Mr. Webb's concluding words deserve to be remembered:—

> "What is necessary before everything else, and what is immediately practicable, is that the natives of India should have more and more place in the councils in India and at home regarding the affairs of India. In proportion as, for the unity of the Empire, it may be considered necessary that the one people should hold the unquestioned superiority in arms, so the other should be allowed full voice in council. Liberalism at home is paying heavily for illiberalism in India. It is difficult to estimate the extent to which reactionary principles are here supported and advanced by returned Indian officials. We are certainly bound to give careful consideration to the most popular exponent of Indian feeling as yet in existence—the Indian National Congress that meets yearly. If more Europeans attended they would better understand the reasonableness and importance of its proceedings. They would give more weight to its resolutions. Until these proceedings have wider space in our newspapers we shall have little right to consider ourselves 'members for India.' The Congress was the most impressive and interesting gathering in which I ever took part. No one could be present during the four days' proceedings, no one could listen to the speeches and realise how English history is being studied and English politics followed in India, without coming to the conclusion that Indian questions are for us serious questions—that India, if left only to the officials, might yet be a tenfold embarrassing Ireland."

Some of the journals which profess to represent the "Imperial," which is also the "cultured" and the "gentlemanly," party gave their readers a taste of their quality the other day. In the House of Commons, on April 9th, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., the only Indian member of the House, and a leader of the large and increasing Indian Parliamentary party, joined, and joined rightly, in the farewell expressions of thanks and esteem to the retiring Speaker. Mr. Naoroji's remarks, which, as the *Times*' report showed, were greeted with cheers, were in unexceptionable taste and of exemplary brevity:

> "In the peculiar position in which I am placed here I offer to you, Mr. Speaker, my most sincere and heartfelt gratitude for all the kindness and helpful counsel you have always extended to me."

Whereupon the *Standard* and the *St. James's Gazette* permitted themselves to refer to Mr. Naoroji in terms which I can only describe as worthy of the baser sort of Anglo-Indian journal.

The *St. James's*, which is conspicuous for its habitual arrogance towards the people of India and their representatives, wrote, in a leading article, of "the impudent self-assertion of the Parsee gentleman who, by a strange freak of electoral fate, represents a Metropolitan constituency," while on another page it printed this precious paragraph:

> "When all the recognised parties in the House had expressed yesterday through their respective leaders their appreciation of Mr. Peel's services, members were startled to see Mr. Naoroji suddenly rise to his feet. What special claim the member for Central Finsbury had to speak on such an occasion it is hard to discover. Mr. Naoroji himself based his claim on his 'peculiar position,' whatever that may mean. The most notable peculiarities of his position are the extreme narrowness of the majority by which he holds his seat, and the fact that he claims in some mysterious way to represent the 'people of India,' though he has spent a large part of his life in England and belongs by birth to the small Parsi community localised in the Bombay Presidency, which is about as closely connected with the majority of the people of India as it is with the people of Venezuela."

In the same handsome temper the *Standard* wrote:

> "The rising of Mr. Naoroji on the vote of thanks to the Speaker created a good deal of surprise, and would probably have excited some resentment, had it not been that any manifestation of feeling would have disturbed the impressive character of the scene. Mr. Naoroji represents nobody but himself, and has not a single follower in the House. There was a general feeling yesterday that the speeches were unnecessarily numerous, and that on these ceremonial occasions it would be better to revert to the earlier practice of allowing the leaders of the two great parties to speak the sentiments of the whole House."

It would be as idle to reply to the irresponsible insolence of these paragraphs as it would be to observe that Mr. Naoroji, whose position in the House of Commons is not determined by the amount of his majority, did not invent the present mode of procedure on the occasion of a Speaker's retirement. But the paragraphs are worth noting as a sample of the temper in which some English journals apparently think it becoming and patriotic to refer to the one Indian member of Parliament. If English newspapers indulge in such licence in London, what can we expect from Anglo-Indian officials in India? *Quid domini faciant, audent cum talia fures?* It is not thus that Englishmen win the confidence and affection of their Indian fellow-subjects.

Mr. A. O. Hume contributed to a recent number of INDIA an article upon the attempt of the Madras Government to annex the Laccadive Islands belonging to Sultan Ali Rájá of Cannanore. The latter has, I learn, addressed to the Viceroy a memorial appealing against the arbitrary proceedings of the Madras Government in depriving him of his hereditary title of "Sultan." It is suggested that the purpose of this deprivation is to reduce him to the position of an ordinary landlord as a preliminary to depriving him of his Sovereign rights. It is high time that the whole matter was brought to the notice of the House of Commons.

By the sudden death of General Sir George Chesney the Conservative party in the House of Commons has lost a valuable and highly respected member, and the Indian National Congress an opponent so reckless that he was more helpful than some supporters. His life, which lasted sixty-five years, was one of remarkable success. A youth of eighteen he joined the Bengal Engineers; ten years later he received the brevet rank of major and the medal and clasp; ten years later, again, his book on "Indian Polity" made his reputation as a military reformer. He afterwards became Military Secretary to the Government of India, and later, as a member of the Governor-General's Council, shared in the responsibility for the disastrous policy of aggression beyond the North-West frontier. It was said of the late Mr. Froude that there was too much romance in his history and too much history in his romance. Sir George Chesney's "The Battle of Dorking," which made his name with the British public, was a story with a purpose and, remarkably enough, its author lived to see his purpose—the strengthening of our home defences—accomplished. Shortly before his death he re-wrote "Indian Polity," in which the account of the reform movement in India is too little removed from the imagination of the novelist. In Parliament, where he attempted on behalf of Indian officialism to reply to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Sir George Chesney was not a conspicuous success. As the *Times* justly says, "he did not show himself to be an eloquent or a brilliant speaker, though he was a good talker and possessed a keen sense of humour." The Duke of Argyll, who has thought it necessary to call attention to his own share in originating the Royal Indian Engineering College at Cooper's Hill, describes Sir G. Chesney as "very able, highly cultivated and accomplished, a thorough gentleman, and with a personal manner of great modesty, gentleness and charm." It is a pity that, in dealing with the non-official aspect of Indian affairs, Sir G. Chesney's prejudices habitually got the better of his sympathy, but those to whom he was most keenly opposed agreed in recognising his unfailing frankness and his disposition to be fair to the best of his knowledge. His attack upon Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji secured for the member for India a national ovation of unprecedented enthusiasm; and his attack upon the Indian National Congress provoked a brilliant and memorable rejoinder from the late Chief Justice of Bengal.

Sir George Chesney died suddenly on March 31st, and surprise has been expressed that, in these circumstances, the April number of this Review contained so severe a reply to his attack upon the Indian National Congress. The sentiments of our critics do more crédit, if one may employ a cant distinction, to their hearts than to their heads. If they knew anything at all about the subject on which they express an opinion—the method, that is to say, of producing a periodical publication—they would know that articles contained in a Review dated April are written and printed before March 31st. As a matter of fact, the April number of India had been published and circulated to subscribers some days before Sir G. Chesney's lamented death.

The Hon. Mahárájá Pratáp Náráyan Singh Bahádur of Ayodhya has just enriched the literature of his country by the publication of a handsome and scholarly work ("Rasakusumákar." "Indian Press," Allahabad), on the Art of Rhetoric as illustrated by Hindu poets. The literature of this language, the most widely diffused of all the vernaculars of India, is rich in poetic treasures, from which a copious selection, numbering upwards of five hundred excerpts, has been made in order to afford examples of the language, the rhythm, and the figures employed to call forth the various emotions which constitute the *rasa*, or "flavours," of literary composition. Indians are as precise in the analysis of the passions, and in the classification of their subtle distinctions, as they are in their analysis of the various operations of the mind. They name nine primary sentiments as the emotions which impart "relish" to literature. Every composition falls under one or other of the following designations: Erotic, comic, pathetic, wrathful, heroic, terrible, repulsive, marvellous, or quietistic. Thirty-four accessory or transitory emotions arise from these primary sentiments, including the feelings of apprehension, envy, weariness, despondency, resolution, arrogance, shame, joy, and so forth. These emotions are supposed in their turn to give rise to effects which contribute to arouse the desired emotion in the heart. There are two "excitants" to these emotions, which are termed "enhancers" and "fundamentals." The "excitants" include the whole *dramatis personæ* and machinery of the poem, the "enhancers" being the friend, the servant, the jester, the parasite, or the messenger, as well as the seasons, the wind, the forest, the garden, or the moonlight. The "fundamental excitants" are the heroine and the hero themselves.

The theory, with its amusing mathematical precision, is thus seen to be fairly simple. It is only in working out the system and in pursuing the minute subdivisions of the subject that the intricacy becomes apparent. In the present volume the Mahárájá has made an effort to place the whole subject on a scientific basis. He gives us a careful grouping of the several parts, and supplies tabulated schemes and other accessories to a clear apprehension of the whole. A great array of books on the same topic has been put together during past centuries, but no preceding author has condescended to simplify the subject, or to bring its manifold peculiarities into view as parts of a harmonious whole. Hitherto the subject has been expounded in verse, which left the definitions in their primitive obscurity. The Mahárájá for the first time gives each definition in prose. He has also supplied a glossary of obscure and archaic terms in the verses, an index to the verses themselves, and indexes to the subjects of which the book treats, arranged both textually and alphabetically. A special feature of the book is the set of forty plates with which the text is enriched. They illustrate the various emotions and their "excitants." They have been well executed, and the whole volume is sumptuous to look upon. Fidus.

CHITRAL: AN OBJECT-LESSON.

We have no apology to make for the manifest predominance of one subject in our present issue. The invasion of Chitral and the attention that the progress of the campaign has attracted in the United Kingdom offer an opportunity of unsurpassable importance to those who desire to see the insensate policy of military aggression beyond the frontiers of India discredited and abandoned at once and for all. There is no need to recapitulate here the incidents of the recent campaign or the considerations upon which the statesmanlike policy of Lord Lawrence, too lightly reversed by Lord Salisbury and Lord Lytton, was based. The former are fresh in the reader's mind, and the latter are set forth elsewhere by experts of the highest authority. But we may well remind British electors that when, either by express approval or, as commonly happens, by mere indifference, they sanction the so-called "forward "frontier policy," they incur a terrible responsibility. "What you want," as Mr. John Bright said, "is a "new and a wiser and a broader policy, and that "policy, I much fear, you will never have from the "Government of Calcutta until the people of England say that it is their policy and must be "adopted." Now, if ever—while the mingled recollections of the Chitral campaign and the imposition of the cotton duties are still fixed and fresh—is the moment to bring home to the electorate the folly of the endlessly extravagant military policy which lies at the root of the financial embarrassments of the Government of India. We are extremely glad to learn that the National Reform Union has appreciated the significance of the occasion, and that, at its meeting in Manchester on May 1, Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., and Mr.

W. S. Caine, M.P., will expound to a representative audience of Lancashire men the true causes of India's chronic difficulties. It is earnestly to be hoped that not Lancashire electors only but the electorate of the United Kingdom will learn the lesson and, before it is too late, insist through their Parliamentary representatives upon a saner policy for the common benefit alike of ourselves and of our Indian fellow-subjects.

RURAL INDIA.[1]

THE kind of information about the way in which the people of India, or some of them, live and move and have their being, which Mr. Carstairs furnishes in this useful volume, is of the utmost service to people in England who wish to get at some tangible knowledge of our great Eastern dependency. Mr. Carstairs has had some twenty years of official experience; he has mixed freely, so far as an official can mix freely, with the people; and he writes in a tone that persuades us that he has no object to serve but the truth. The personal element remains to be weighed and eliminated, and the remainder ought then to be very valuable. He states his position as follows:

> "Before we have lived long in the country, and while our imagination has not been dulled by too much contact with actual facts, we are perhaps better qualified than afterwards to form broad views and express them with confidence. A certain bold disregard of details is almost necessary if a strong effect is wanted. I feel that a twenty years' training of close attention to detail has to a great extent deprived me of any power in that way. I shall attempt rather to describe the effect on my own mind of this long personal contact with India and its people, than to impress lessons or information on the minds of others. . . . . I come forward as a witness, not as a judge, claiming nothing more than a belief in my sincerity. . . . . I do not profess a complete knowledge of the subject, but admit that my knowledge is limited and partial. My career has been in Lower Bengal, one out of the many provinces of India, and even within that province the greater portion is personally unknown to me. It is of the people I have seen and lived among that I would be understood to speak. . . . . Their customs forbid social intercourse, and their literature is, with a few exceptions, not informing on the point [of their character]. Such information as I have had has been gained chiefly from litigation and from talks. I have had before me during my twenty years of Indian life scores of thousands of law cases civil and criminal, and these have given me many a peep into the social and family life of the country, otherwise veiled from me. . . . . Then I have spent, besides the longer time when I lived at my headquarters, some 1,500 days in touring about among the villages, during which time I have traversed some 15,000 miles, going with my tents from village to village, mostly over ground unknown to the tourist, unheard of by Europeans in the greater Indian towns. On these rounds I have seen and conversed with men of all degrees, rich and poor, great and small, learned and ignorant, and of all religions, castes, and occupations. . . . . I have had reason to believe that, different as is my race and remote my home, I possessed the confidence, and, I fain would think, also the affection of many among them. I dare not say I know them, but I can honestly say that all this time I have tried hard to understand them."

Now this passage certainly discloses a most important range of experience, an ingrained caution and sense of proportion, and an invincible modesty. Each of these factors contributes very largely to the value of Mr. Carstairs's statements. Mr. Carstairs also frankly acknowledges his home longings in his lonely isolation, his strong and ineradicable feelings of race pride, and his sense of the prestige of England. He concludes that we cannot grow like the Indians, and that the Indians cannot, except on the surface, become assimilated to us. "There are Bengalis," he says, "—all honour to " them—who are in advance of their fellows, but so " few are our opportunities of testing them to the full " that even these I cannot trust deeply. Courteous " and friendly when all is well; not very satisfactory " to do business with at any time; in time of trouble " and adversity, broken reeds. That is what they " seem to me." He fears a break on an occasion of real strain. Whether or not his Scotch temperament carries his caution to an extreme limit, it is an opinion that deserves respect as being reasoned, honest, and judicially expressed. For our own part, we think his constitutional and patriotic standard, together with the circumstances in which his experience was gathered, has impressed an excessive severity upon his judgment.

Mr. Carstairs gives special pains to the description of the Indian Hodge. "How does neighbour Hodge " live? What does he think of? What are his " hopes, fears, ambitions? How (most important of " all) does he quarrel, and what about?" The main varieties—there are many varieties, even within Mr. Carstairs's knowledge—are the fighting man, the drudge, and the pioneer. "The fighting men " are to be found chiefly on the banks of the great " rivers—the Ganges, the Brahmaputra, and the " Megna—where, after each year's floods, thousands " of acres of fertile land are found to have been " formed or swept away, according to the caprice of " the stream." The fighting Hodge is on the watch to rush in and occupy the new land, holding it against all comers by the strong arm. These conditions point to a wide expanse of instability and to large possibilities of misery. The fighting quality, however, which is good enough for such occasions, is inadequate for the native army, which finds its recruits outside Bengal. The drudges are hereditary labourers on the vast expanses of plain that have been for generations under close cultivation. They form the great mass of the agriculturists, Hindu and Mussulman, and, by their natural increase, constitute the "congested districts." The pioneers are found where jungle is yet to clear and waste land to reclaim, contending not with other men, but with wild beasts and nature—"on the borders " of Eastern Bengal, in the Terai, in the Delta of the " Ganges, and in the less dense but less fertile forests " of South-Western Bengal."

> "Hodge has a very narrow horizon, generally bounded by the village and the market town. He thinks, not of the wide world, but of his own little world—the village. . . . . His interest in outside matters is almost nothing; and why? Because his mind is held firm by village interests. His dreams are within the village, and seldom wander elsewhere; and his rage, when kindled, burns, not against the distant stranger, but against his kinsmen and neighbours."

Mr. Carstairs illustrates the life of Hodge in large detail—his daily labours, his domestic anxieties, his social troubles, his relations to the landlord, the money-lender, and the village ruffian, and his position before the representatives of law and order. It is a lamentably confined, troubled, and unhopeful picture. What an amount of suggestion there is in the following anecdote:

---

[1] "Human Nature in Rural India." By R. Carstairs, B.C.S. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons.

> "Hodge is, we will say, one of the peasant proprietors of the village. He cultivates a few acres of land, out of which he has to make enough to live on, and to meet his expenses. He is too proud, as a rule, to work for hire. . . . I remember once, when there was a flood in the river, which was eight feet above the level of the country, only kept back from devastating it by a rotten embankment. The embankment was all but topped, and was showing signs of a flaw, and we were at our wits' end for labour to stop the breach. Just below the place where the breach threatened was a village, which must certainly be swept away first if the embankment broke, lives being endangered and property destroyed. But not a soul in the village would stir. They said this was coolies' work, and the business of the Government, and they would do no work except on their own fields. They felt about it just as a London clerk would feel if called on to work as a blacksmith."

There are some painful statements, too, about sanitary carelessness and ignorance. "Hodge's water supply is often very bad. What he has he makes bad use of, for he will bathe his cattle, bathe himself, and wash his dirty clothes in the reservoir itself, and then drink the nastiness afterwards." "If impurities get into the water, that is the affair of the water." "Water is the great purifier, and Hodge believes that it purifies everything, and is of so great virtue that it cannot itself be defiled."

Turning to the industrial classes, Mr. Carstairs finds the chief characteristic to be that indigenous industry "is all hands and no head—all labour and no capital—all instinct and little thought—power of imitation but little originality; and more patience than energy." The capitalist trader exploits the skilled artisan, generally holding him in his debt and doling out to him enough to keep him alive. The two classes who work the springs of all industry in India are the money-lender and the landlord. Mr. Carstairs, while admitting the very objectionable characteristics of the money-lender, fairly states the case from "Hunks's" point of view. "Hunks cannot help himself. Needs must when the devil drives. And this will continue to go on until money-lending transactions are conducted out of savings instead of from the living fund." The landlord is similarly driven in his endeavours to make ends meet, what with inherited debt, litigation, charges, and family complications.

There seems to us to be a considerable strain of caricature in Mr. Carstairs's "dream of Home Rule" in his chapter on "The Bengal Republic," which ends with the moral not to deliver the tasks of might to weakness. At the same time it may be admitted that the people of the land possess less motive power than the British, without admitting that the native power is inadequate, under more just conditions of estimate, for its own tasks. The chapter on "Quarrels" is amusing and suggestive; and, if the illustrative example of how the law is made to serve local purposes be not overdrawn, it shows very strongly how much has yet to be done towards an effective legal administration. The final chapter, "A Peep into the Sonthal Country," contains a suggestion that deserves notice. The question in the village is, not "master or no master," but "who is master?" The thing is to get the right village headman. "The chief significance of the Sonthal system is that it is the result of education, not of a subject people by a government, but of a government by a subject people." Mr. Carstairs speaks energetically against the official tendency to break down the system and bring the Sonthals within the pale of "civilisation." "I hope," he says, "that time will never come. Rather do I look forward to the time when this excellent system shall be extended to the whole province. Why not? It is not peculiar to the Sonthals, but was once common —as may it become again!—to all races in the country. This is my earnest hope, because I know no other method of laying a firm foundation for a strong and free fabric of local self-government."

MILITARY AGGRESSION AND THE BUDGET.

[From a Bombay Correspondent.]

A Bombay correspondent, writing at the end of March, says:—The past week has been eventful in two respects—for the Budget and for the reverse to some of the party of Dr. Robertson in the Chitral territory. As to the latter, it is not surprising. The Government of India rushes into these border expeditions with a foolhardiness and enthusiasm which are simply astonishing. The question of upholding British prestige will now be flourished in the face of the world. The expedition will be pushed forward at all hazards and a crore, or possibly more, will be spent. And this, too, within a week of the Budget, which provides the ridiculous sum of 15 lakhs for a force of 14,000 men and followers, marching through an impassable country and fighting its way every inch. This is "preparedness" with a vengeance. Would that our rulers might perceive how unrighteous it is to persevere in this policy of external aggression. The wisdom of those dissenters—Sir A. Colvin and Mr. C. P. Ilbert—is being justified, and more than justified. Mr. Mehta attacked the aggressive policy at the recent meeting of the Legislative Council, on the Budget debate. He attacked the aggressive policy with great effect and severely criticised the Finance Minister. The latter endeavoured to defend himself, though not without a sneer at the Memorandum presented to the House of Commons last year upon Indian expenditure. He is reported to have observed that the Memorandum was replied to by Mr. Fowler. Of course, as everybody knows, Mr. Fowler steered clear of it by saying that he had no time to criticise the figures in detail. The Memorandum was corroborated by Sir Auckland Colvin. Is the Finance Minister going to contradict him? The Viceroy made a long speech explaining the reasons of the Chitral Expedition. We are all disappointed with Lord Elgin. He has proved to be too plastic a tool in the hands of his advisers. He lacks firmness.

The Budget is, of course, a specious document. It reveals the usual art of cooking but nothing beyond it. Of what value is a statement of this kind which is falsified within a week? The Chitral expedition will certainly cost nearer 150 lakhs than the 15 provided in the estimates. Yet we are told of a surplus of 4 lakhs. But, to put aside the cost of the invasion of Chitral, what are we to say of the suspension of the Famine Fund? A special tax was raised to provide it. It was to be considered no ordinary expenditure. But how does our Imperial book-keeper treat the matter? He says that the fund can only be met out of a surplus. The genesis of that fund is well-known. The Famine Fund was to be considered as an annual recurring expenditure. It was never intended to be provided from a surplus because special provision was made whence to derive it. The special tax which was levied is still maintained. It is idle, therefore, to say at this time of day that the annual contribution to the Famine Fund can only be provided from a surplus. But in this way the Government relieves the debit side of the account of a crore and a-half. An honest Budget would have shown the amount. Virtually, then, by under estimating the cost of the Chitral expedition, and omitting or suspending the Famine Fund, the Finance Minister produces a spurious surplus. In reality there should have been a deficit of 3 crores after taking into consideration the new additional receipts from the import duties to that amount. Here we see the woeful condition of the Indian Exchequer. But there is something else which has to be taken into account. Does it not stand to reason that if one receives from somebody else a certain sum for a specific purpose, and if afterwards one spends only a portion of it for that purpose, and the balance for another purpose, he is committing a breach of faith? Even if one diverts it for a time, is it not fair that the money should be refunded? Let me apply this illustration to the process of the sterling remittances last year. They amounted, under different heads of sterling expenditure, to 17 millions. The taxpayers, under various heads, provided the receipts to meet the equivalent—namely, about 34 crores of rupees. What happened? Not 17, but only 15 millions were remitted. The remaining 2 millions, or 4 crores, were diverted to another purpose, and, in order to satisfy the demands of the Secretary of State, the Government of India borrowed 2 millions in England. It was, they said, a temporary loan. But even this year they have not been able to repay it. They are about to renew it. But under any circumstances they were bound to provide for the 4 crores from these receipts. They have done nothing of the kind. Had they done so, the deficit on this account alone would have been 4 crores. The Government has concealed this liability. Virtually the provision this year for the bills of the Secretary of State should have been:

	Millions.
1895-96	17
Diverted to other use in 1894-95 ..	2
Total	19

But the Government provides only for 17 millions. It is thus evident that if the Budget had been honestly prepared it would have shown a deficit of 7 crores:

	Crores.
Chitral (probable expenditure) ..	1½
Famine Fund, suspended	1½
Balance of last year's remittance diverted	4
Total	7

What an appalling deficit, and that, too, after three crores of new taxation: (i) an item of military expenditure (Chitral) is under estimated; (ii) an item of annually recurring expenditure (ordinary) is suspended; (iii) thirdly an item to meet a liability is spent elsewhere, and a loan borrowed. Another item ought to have appeared in a balance sheet purporting to represent a full and fair statement of receipts and expenditure. Had the two millions not been borrowed, the case would have been different. In reality the Government raised the loan by a side wind, so to say, and under-estimated last year's deficit to that extent. If they cannot repay it, it will mean so much more added to the permanent debt.

These are the three big blots which I find in the Budget. I refrain from discussing other points, exchange, for example, and military expenditure.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

A meeting will be held in the Concert Hall, Peter Street, Manchester, on Wednesday, May 1st, at 8 p.m., when addresses will be delivered on the subject of "The Civil and Military Expenditure in India," by Sir William Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., and Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P. The chair will be taken by the Hon. Philip Stanhope, M.P., President of the National Reform Union. The importance of this subject to Lancashire, emphasised as it has been by the recent imposition of import duties on cotton, has led the Committee of the National Reform Union to arrange for this meeting.

"We can only partially console ourselves (wrote the *St. James's Gazette* of April 25) by reflecting on the excellence of the Indian Army, as shown, for instance, in the present dashing little Chitral campaign. True, we have a fine army in India; but it is not due to the English War Office, nor is it paid for, as most Englishmen no doubt imagine, out of the Army Estimates voted by the House of Commons. India pays for its own armed forces, out of its own revenues." That is a fact which is too often forgotten in the United Kingdom.

The following important motion, in the name of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., still appears in the order-book of the House of Commons: That, in the opinion of this House, in order to preserve and maintain the stability of the British power, the loyalty, confidence, contentment, and gratitude of the people of British India, to improve their material and moral condition, and to increase largely commercial and industrial benefits to the people of the United Kingdom, it is expedient that the solemn pledges of the Act of 1833, of the Proclamation of 1858 after the Mutiny, of the Proclamation of 1877 on the assumption of the Imperial title at the great Delhi Durbar, and of the further confirmation of these Proclamations on the Jubilee of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen and Empress of India, should be fulfilled by, among other reforms, giving effect to the Resolution adopted by this House on 3rd June, 1893, viz.: That all open competitive examinations heretofore held in England alone for appointments to the Civil Services of India shall henceforth be held simultaneously both in India and England, such examinations in both countries being identical in their nature, and all who compete being finally classified in one list according to merit.

Mr. Naoroji has also given notice that he will call attention to the refusal by the Secretary of State for India to grant certain returns.

On the subject of remuneration of Europeans Mr. Naoroji has given notice of the following motion:—That, in the opinion of this House, it is just and expedient that the financial relations between the United Kingdom and British India should be so adjusted, with regard to all the expenditure incurred in the employment of Europeans in the British-Indian services, civil and military, in this country and in India, that some fair and adequate portion of such expenditure should be borne by the British Exchequer in proportion to the pecuniary and political benefits accruing to the United Kingdom from Her Gracious Majesty's sway over India; and that the British Treasury should sustain a fair and equitable portion of all expenditure incurred on all military and political operations beyond the boundaries of India in which both Indian and British interests are jointly concerned.

A large gathering assembled at 14, Beaufort Gardens, on Saturday, April 6th, in response to Lady Wedderburn's invitation, to meet some Indian ladies and enjoy the music which one of them supplied. Members of Parliament, including Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. Alfred Webb were present, besides a large number of Indian gentlemen in native or European costume. Among them were the husbands of some of the Indian ladies. Naturally (the *Queen* says) interest centred in the latter, whose pleasant manners, readiness to talk and to be amused, suggested to the mind that, if ever life in the zenanas had been dull and bored, the experience had been quite left behind.

The ladies were dressed in a modified English costume, but retained Indian jewellery and the beautiful drapery known as the sari. Sowbhagyavati Shevantibai Nikambé, in excellent English, and without a shade of nervousness, addressed the gathering on the subject of her school at Gilgaum, Bombay, for fifty Indian girls, mostly married.

The other Indian ladies present were Mrs. Boyce whose husband is reading law at Lincoln's Inn, and who has assumed an English name; Mrs. Gupta, a Bengali; and Mrs. Thomas, widow of a Eurasian, the sister of Cornelia Sorabji, whose musical talent has already been mentioned. All the ladies seemed to have an excellent command of the language, expressing themselves with great readiness. Should the fashion spread of Indian ladies accompanying their husbands to England and making acquaintance with English social life, one cannot help wondering what will be the effect upon Indian life. In all probability (the *Queen* thinks) it will, for good or evil, hasten the breaking up of caste.

"There is," said Mr. Villiers, the "Father of the House of Commons," to an interviewer the other day, "much in our government of India that it is difficult to defend, and, in my opinion, the extravagances of our administration ought to be checked—I mean our military expenditure as much as anything. We must keep our promises to the natives. The cotton duties will not be tolerated for long, and as soon as deficiencies in revenue have been made up they must go. They are a kind of Protection, and I do not like them. As to the movements of native opinion, it is difficult to estimate them, but I think Mr. Fowler is not disregarding them."

A Bombay correspondent writes that Lord Sandhurst "is winning golden opinions on all sides."

The Duke of Argyll, in the course of a letter on the origin of the Royal Indian Engineering College at Cooper's Hill, says that "the House of Commons as a whole has the best disposition towards our Indian empire, and very rarely interferes with its government. But when it does, the India Office is too often at the mercy of many personal or sectional interests at home. The majority of its members are ignorant and indifferent, and can with difficulty be brought up to support the Government on any contested point. . . . . Cabinets are always bored if Indian questions are brought before them. . . . . There is chronic war between the India Office and the Treasury on many questions of charge upon the two revenues."

These are the opinions of the Duke of Argyll. Fortunately, as a matter of fact, the House of Commons is showing its good disposition towards our Indian empire by interfering more and more in its government. The India Office is being taught its proper place in the general scheme of things, and ignorance and indifference are being displaced in Parliament by knowledge and interest. There was no Indian Parliamentary Committee when the Duke of Argyll was at the India Office.

The *St. James's Gazette* thinks that not enough credit has been given to Ulster for forming the splendid material which Sir George Chesney himself developed with assiduous industry. He owed much to the blood of his staunch old grandfather Alexander, or the "Old Captain," as they called him at Annalong—a stern unbending heart of steel, who had often rallied the Carolina Royalists to the support of Lord Rawdon's army in the War of Independence; who thrashed a sense of duty and right feeling conscientiously into his children—with admirable results,—and put his son a lieutenant nine years old on horseback at the head of a company of the royal volunteers in the '98. The "Old Captain" was what they call a "grand man" in county Down, where he long commanded the coast-guard and fought sanguinary smugglers. His character came out strongly in his son Francis, the greatest of the family, who, when he was delayed by fever on the famous "Euphrates Expedition," refused to sleep to any other music than the rivetting of the boiler-plates, that told his delirious mind that the work was going on.

Sir George Chesney himself had much of this indomitable Ulster pluck. He was a man of great resolution and immense perseverance. Quite late in life he revived his Greek by reading his grammar every day in the train and systematically getting up his vocabulary between Wimbledon and Victoria. There was a deal of the old Ironside in his blood. One has but to read the early record of the family and the adventures of the "Old Captain" to realize that. Besides, Sir George's grandmother was a niece of Margaret Wilson. Whoso cannot construe this must go to his neglected Macaulay.

When George Chesney was born, his uncle, "Euphrates" Chesney, had not yet made acquaintance with the river which was for many years his chief thought: but he had demonstrated, for the first time, long before Lesseps, that the Suez Canal was a practical scheme for engineers, which nobody had believed since Napoleon's expedition. He sent his report, recommending the canal to Lord Palmerston, who let it lie; but the discoverer's thoughts were even then of the future of the distinguished Indian statesman whom we are now mourning. This diary—up the Nile—records that he was still thinking about his brother's orphan children: "May God enable me to do what is right by those he has left." ("Life of General F. R. Chesney," 197-199.) In after-years he did "what was right" to advance his nephews with all the zeal and loyalty of his stalwart Ulster soul.

Mr. D. E. Wacha has compiled, and the Commercial Press at Bombay has published, a handy little pamphlet containing extracts from Major Evans Bell's works on "the true Imperial policy with regard to the government of India." The pamphlet is issued under the title of the late Sir G. Chesney's well-known book—"Indian Polity"—from which, needless to say, it differs greatly.

An Indian paper states that "Mir Sultan, a grandson of the late King of Delhi, is now a head clerk in the office of the District Superintendent of Police, Yemethen." On this statement the *Reis and Rayyet* makes some notable comments. "The late King of Delhi," says our Calcutta contemporary, "was, of course, the unfortunate Bahadur Shah, who was deported to Burma after the suppression of the Mutiny. As to Mir Sultan, whose son is he? Was his father one of those unfortunate princes who were shot, after they had surrendered, by Hodson? Probably Mir is no legitimate descendant of Bahadur Shah. But legitimate or otherwise, this young man may have Bahadur Shahs', and therefore Akbar's, blood in his veins. Who is there that will not honour him for earning his bread by industry, instead of nursing any sentiment about his birth and taking advantage of the generosity of some Mussulman nobleman whose ancestors had served the House of Delhi?"

There is here a sense of the dignity of independence and of work such as would have delighted Carlyle. It is well that this descendant of kings should prefer to earn the bread of industry rather than to live as a dependant, and it is a good sign also that his decision should have the approbation of those for whom the *Reis and Rayyet* can speak. Apart from this aspect of the incident, it is certainly a curious instance of the "vicissitudes of families" that a representative of the race of the great Akbar should be seated upon a clerk's stool instead of an imperial throne, and should wield the pen of a ready writer instead of the sword of a conquering soldier.

That veteran writer on Indian affairs, Mr. John Dacosta, has collected and republished in a compact volume fifteen of his essays which have appeared at various times in the *Law Magazine and Review*. The essays contain authentic information which will undoubtedly prove useful when administrative reform is undertaken, and they are a highly valuable adjunct to Mr. Dacosta's well-known work, "A Scientific Frontier."

"The Indian Dyers' and Calico Printers' Diary and Year Book" (1895. Proprietor, Morargi V. Naik, Bombay; Printed at the Education Society's Press) is now first presented to the public, and appears to contain much useful matter in a convenient form. It gives a list of the principal firms employed in the industries named, though there are some omissions, as it was impossible to obtain particulars. The cotton spinning and weaving mills are enumerated, and those are noted at which dyeing and printing are likewise carried on. (We notice that there is a puzzling and apparently unnecessary change of signification in the sign used to denote the latter.) No particulars are given of the indigo factories as their number is so large, but it is remarked that many of them belong to native proprietors.

A large increase in the import of Aniline and Alizadine dyes, which is noted more than once, points to the increasing tendency of these dyes to displace the indigenous vegetable product. The change is in many cases advantageous, for these dyes are cheaper and the necessary processes more cleanly than is the case with the indigo dyes. The science of dyeing has made such rapid strides during the last few years, and is now engaging the attention of so many eminent European chemists, that it is probable that manufacture from the vegetable product will soon be entirely displaced by a synthetic method. Under these circumstances it is of the highest importance that Indian dye-houses should be under the management of competent men, well-trained in the scientific side of their art. The number of places where dyeing and printing is carried on has increased very much in the last ten years, and the advantage to manufacturers of cotton goods in dyeing and printing their own materials is obvious. There is an opening here for skilled workmanship, and it appears that pupils of the Kala-Bhavan at Baroda have already been employed in this way.

THE VILLAGE COMMUNITY IN INDIA.

By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.

In February last, Mr. Krishna Menon, Lecturer on Agriculture at the Sydapet College, Madras, who has been extending his knowledge and experience of his subject during a prolonged visit to this country, delivered a very able and most interesting address to the Indian Section of the Society of Arts on "Village Communities in Southern India." Mr. Menon's lecture will be found in full, with the discussion that followed it, in the *Journal of the Society of Arts* for February 22. The lecturer did ample justice to the services of Sir Henry Maine in drawing the attention Western students to the village communities of India. His criticisms of Maine are substantially just, and, if his immediate purpose had not restrained him, might have been carried a great deal further. Since Maine wrote, however, very much more has been done to throw light on the ancient institution than Mr. Menon acknowledged. At the same time there is vast scope for the labours of fresh inquirers. Mr. Menon was deeply indebted, at many points of his address, to the masterly paper by Mr. John Adam on "Chingleput and the Village Community," which was printed in Part I. of the "Proceedings of the Maine Historical Society of Madras" (April to September, 1890). Now that Mr. Adam has returned to Madras, it is to be hoped that he will find time from his professional work to follow up his Chingleput investigation with many similar inquiries, and will also stir up other local students to emulation in the same field of research. The deep importance of such studies is universally recognised by those who understand their bearings. Mr. Menon, too, will be expected to give us further fruits of his studies in this department.

In the first part of his paper, which is really an historical exposition and argument, Mr. Menon sets himself to prove "that the people of Southern India had, from time immemorial, an inalienable right in the soil they tilled; that they maintained this right through all the changes that have taken place in the history of India till the advent of the British; and that the village communes they prized so much were shattered to pieces only after the tremendous blows they received from the early British administrators, ignorant of the past history and genius of the people which built up a system of institutions of surpassing vitality." Though Mr. Menon lays himself open to criticism at more points than one in his details, it must be conceded that he substantially proves his propositions. His description of the constitution of a village commune in the Madras Presidency consists with the descriptions of previous writers and exhibits a close analogy to similar institutions in other parts of India.

> "The organisation of a village commune in the Madras Presidency is complete even to minuteness. Its constitution is democratic, self-sustained, self-sufficing. It has all the features of a highly organised society, like one of the cantons of the Swiss Republic. Its functionaries are various, and are answerable only to the village, there being no representative of the paramount power to be answerable [to]. The village [council] consists of an elective body called the *panchayat*, or the assembly of five elders. There was no hereditary chief or headman, but one of the five officiated as head at the deliberations of the council. Then there were a host of minor officials to carry out the executive work of the commune. These may be enumerated as follows: (1) *karnam*, accountant, whose business is to keep the village register, showing the area cultivated each year by each sharer, the extent of the land irrigated, and other matters pertaining to agriculture; (2) *nirgunti*, distributor of water for irrigation purposes; (3) *alayar*, village watcher, who is otherwise known as the village police; (4) *vettyan*, village scavenger, who has to look to burials, cremation, etc.; (5) schoolmaster; (6) doctor; (7) astrologer, or the village meteorologist, who is to give a forecast of the weather, the time for sowing, harvesting, etc.; (8) the priest; (9) the washerman, barber, potter, carpenter, smith, etc. All these officers and functionaries had a share in the produce of the soil. The constitution of the village Government was essentially a body democratic. According to Mr. Ellis, 'the duties are discharged by the village senate, *gramapravarticam.*' In this assembly every sharer has a seat and a voice."

There are also interesting passages in Mr. Menon's description of the methods followed by the Hindu village communes in the management of the arable land. One method is called *Samudayam*, by which the land was "cultivated by a joint stock of labour, cattle, and implements, the produce being shared by the members of the village community according to their respective shares." This is the more ancient system; the other system, known as *Kareiyedu*, represents a stage of development. By the latter system, "the lands were temporarily distributed by lot into separate shares, and were subject to periodical redistribution." "The *Kareiyedu*," says Mr. Menon, "exists even to this day in some remote parts of Tanjore and Chingleput. The most remarkable feature of the *Kareiyedu* system is the recognition of the absolute principle of collectivism in conformity with the idea of individualism. . . . As late as 4th July, 1864, the *Kareiyedu* was worked in its entirety in the Tanjore district." Mr. Menon quotes from Sir Henry Stokes a full and lucid account of its operation, which should be compared with Mr. Hodgson's description of the Pudu-vayal (Carnatic) system, in the "Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1830."

There is one incidental point on which Mr. Menon might have profitably stated his grounds in larger and more definite detail. This is the inter-relation of communes and their co-operation in common undertakings. "Sir Henry Maine," he says, "throws a doubt whether the various communes ever met through their representatives to discuss questions of common polity, such as the management of temple affairs, the construction of irrigation works, the distribution of water to various villages, etc.; in fact, whether the Hindus ever rose beyond the independence of a village commune." Mr. Menon contends strenuously "that the autonomous village communes combined for various purposes, worked in harmony through their representatives on questions of common interest, . . . in fact, from a small village union, or *panchayat*, the assembly of five, they rose to representative municipal organisations which successfully carried out and maintained great public works of irrigation and transit. Evidences," he affirms, "are not wanting to prove that these municipal organisations met in grand assembly round the king's throne, and they dictated terms to the king; in fact, it could be shown that under purely Hindu institutions there was no absolute monarchy, that the people were, and are, fully able to manage their internal affairs." Elsewhere Mr. Menon speaks of it as "a well-known fact" that "although these villages were self-contained units in themselves, they were simply part of a whole machinery, a wheel within a wheel." His great example is found in the mighty works of irrigation, and he also cites the case of temples common to several villages, and specifically the practice in Malabar. He explains, indeed, "the three stages of Hindu self-government by three modern institutions." The *Panchayat* corresponds to the vestry; the *Samudayam* (or representative body for managing temple affairs), to the municipal board, or county council; and the *Cheri*, *Karei*, or *Sangam* (or body, presided over by the king, "for discussing questions of national importance, in which the interests of several towns or villages are concerned"), to the grand assembly. There is large probability on the face of all this, but the evidence might have been marshalled and sifted with more convincing definiteness. Perhaps Mr. Menon will address himself to this task, free from the limits of an hour's lecture.

The tremendous British blows that, in Mr. Menon's view, shattered the village communes were three: the revenue settlement, the irrigation policy, and the forest conservancy. Is it possible to go back to the old system? Mr. Menon answers unhesitatingly, No. "The conditions are so completely altered, and the system of administration so rigidly crystallised, that no statesman would dare to revolutionise the present system." Still, if the Government would only recognise the intelligence of the people, reforms might be effected on all three points. On the question of revenue settlement, Mr. Menon is silent. As Mr. A. Rogers points out, however, there is much to be said for a proper settlement, though the principles and methods of execution have now and again been wrongheaded and defective. As to irrigation, Mr. Menon would not take the major branch from Government control, but he would hand over to the people the minor branch. Mr. Rogers thinks matters had better be left as they are, with slight exceptions; while Sir Charles A. Turner concludes that "probably no better scheme could be devised than that which had been advocated by Mr. Menon." There are obvious difficulties either way, but to an outsider there appears to be a great deal of force in Mr. Menon's conditions that "the law should be more elastic"—in fact, more suitable to the circumstances of the people—and that "more chances should be given to the people." This contention of Mr. Menon's receives remarkable illustration and confirmation from Mr. Carstairs's sketch of Sonthal local self-government in his "Human Nature in Rural India" (noticed in another column). As to forest conservancy, so far as regards the minor forests and the pasture lands, the Government regulations are intended to be particularly favourable to the rural population, and it is practically only upon the administration of the minor forests that Mr. Menon challenges the Government for a purely popular management. A thorough execution of the Government's intentions, however, would really obviate his difficulty. The simple question is whether this can be attained in practice.

After all, the study of comparative custom appears to confirm the conclusion that the village community is a primitive institution. The races among whom it is found are the backward races; the races that are advanced in civilisation have relegated it to a subordinate position, or practically let it go into desuetude. Here and there, under special circumstances, it might work better than any other system; but even Mr. Menon shrinks from advocating its resuscitation except in minor local matters. On the other hand, the modern system of local self-government is gradually working out the same ends on representative principles; and the more this prevails in India, the less will be felt the desuetude of the village community.

A. F. MURISON.

SOME ASPECTS OF INDIAN FINANCE.

BY T. LLOYD.

The new cotton duties and the speculation in silver have saved the Indian Government from a deficit which at one time threatened to be large. In the Budget twelve months ago it was estimated that even with all the new import duties there would be a deficit of considerably more than a quarter of a crore, and as the year went on the value of the rupee steadily fell, and it looked as if the result would be worse even than the anticipations of the Budget. So serious, indeed, did matters appear in November that the Home Government had to consent to the imposition of the cotton duties. Then came the speculation in silver, based upon the hope of peace between China and Japan, further to relieve the Indian Government. The result is that, according to the revised estimates, the year which ended with March closed with a surplus of nearly a crore of rupees. The Budget twelve months ago estimated very closely the yield of the duties then imposed, with the exception of silver. It was then thought probable that the imports of silver would be very small. As a matter of fact, they proved to be very large; and the duty upon silver, which was estimated to give only a million of rupees, has yielded somewhat more than three and a-half times as much. The cotton duties, too, though in force so short a time, have been satisfactorily productive. The railway receipts have likewise been good, and opium, because of the very high prices that have ruled and the small expenditure on account of the bad crop, has given more than was anticipated. For the new year the expenditure will be larger than in the last by rather more than three crores. But there is expected to be a small surplus, partly because the cotton duties will be collected for the whole year, while the other import duties are expected to be more productive than in the year of imposition. Railways are also expected to yield a larger return. So is opium and so is the land tax. But whether the year will or will not end with a small surplus depends mainly upon the value of the rupee. If it remains as high as it is at present, then the prospect is favourable. If, on the other hand, the exchange value of the rupee falls, the year will unquestionably end with a deficit unless new taxation of some kind can be found or some lucky windfall comes to the relief of the Government. It will be recollected that for the year ended with last month it was expected that the India Council would be able to sell its drafts in London at an average price of 1s. 2d. per rupee, whereas the real average price was only 1s. 1·09d. The real average of the past year is taken in the new Budget as the probable average for the current year, and all the estimates are based upon this assumption. But whether the Council will be able to sell at so good a price remains to be seen. It is clear that the attempt of the Indian Government to fix the value of the rupee has utterly failed, and that it is not, therefore, to any efforts of the Government that we have to look for the prevention of a further fall. What is most hopeful, so far as the exchange question is concerned, is the peace between China and Japan and the speculation in silver that has arisen in consequence. The price of silver has been raised from about 28d. to nearly 31d. per ounce, and if the speculation continues, and the price of silver is kept up in this way, it is possible that the India Council may be able to get even more than the Budget estimate for its drafts. But if the speculation in silver breaks down, then the difficulties of the Indian Government will return. It is curious that Sir James Westland, in his Budget statement, avoids almost altogether the question of exchange, which all previous Finance Ministers have discussed at such length. Either he recognises that his predecessors showed extreme ignorance of the question, and he is, therefore, in no hurry to commit himself; or he hesitates to acknowledge what, however, is the plain truth, that the closing of the Indian mints has utterly failed to steady the exchange, and therefore to fix the value of the rupee.

The utter defeat of China and the probability, therefore, of an early peace stimulated a rather wild speculation in silver some months ago which continues still, and possibly it may go on farther because China consents to pay a war indemnity of about 30 millions sterling to Japan, which is receivable in silver and in five yearly instalments. If the whole of this sum were to be paid in coin it would, of course, have a considerable influence upon the price of silver. China or its agents in London would have to buy six millions sterling worth of silver annually and hand the proceeds over to the Japanese Government. But it need hardly be said that that is not the way in which the indemnity will be paid. In the first place Japan has bought ships and munitions of war in Europe, and now that the war is over and the destruction it has caused has to be made good, she will, no doubt, buy other ships and still more munitions of war. As China will borrow in London and hand over the proceeds to the Japanese agents, those agents of course will be instructed to pay out of the indemnity the purchase money for all their military and naval preparations. Again, the Chinese agents will, of course, avail themselves of all the facilities afforded by trade to remit from this country to Japan without actually sending cash. In all reasonable probability, then, not much more than a third of the indemnity, if so much, will be paid in silver, and ten or twelve millions sterling worth of silver bought over a period of five years will not be likely to raise very much the price of silver. The mere indemnity does not therefore appear likely to help the India Council very much. Of course, if China is to be opened up at once, and the trade of the Empire is to expand rapidly, silver may be required in large amounts for trade purposes. If so, the price will then go up and the India Council will be helped. But it does not seem probable that there will be a very sudden and a very great expansion of trade immediately after the end of a disastrous war. What is much more serious for India is that the close of the war relieves both China and Japan from the necessity of concentrating their efforts upon hostilities. Japan is certain to apply herself to industrial enterprises so as to repair quickly the ravages of the war—always assuming, of course, that she is not confronted by a quarrel with any European power, or powers. The whole influence of Japan will be used to compel China to fulfil her engagements as to opening up her territory to trade. If, then, there are to be four or five new Treaty Ports, if a vast addition is made to the part of the country where foreigners may trade, it is quite likely that China may be about to enter upon an era of very considerable commercial development. But China and Japan, being silver-using countries, will compete with India at a great advantage. The rupee is kept, by the closing of the mints, artificially high, while the yen and the tael are regulated in value by the value of silver. The result is that China and Japan will be able to sell everything in which they compete with India cheaper than India can. China, for example, will be able to undersell India in the tea market, and if the cultivation of tea should be thrown open to Europeans as one consequence of the war, the Indian tea industry may have to go through a period of very sore trial. Should this turn out to be the case, how will the India Council be able to sell its drafts? At present it is able to sell because the exports from India exceed immensely the value of the imports. On the supposition that Chinese and Japanese competition with India increases, that our imports from China and Japan augment while our imports from India fall off, there will be a much smaller excess of Indian exports over imports and consequently there will be a much smaller demand for Council drafts. It is obvious that should this happen the Council can stimulate a demand for its drafts only by reducing the price, and, therefore, it is quite possible that the value of the rupee may be forced lower than it actually would be if the mints were open. It would be rash to say that this will happen, but it is one of the contingencies to which the attention of the Government of India should be directed in time. This year as last year the India Office has to pay in London seventeen millions sterling, and that vast sum can be raised only by selling Council drafts. If the exports from India are checked by increased competition it is perfectly clear that the Council can sell its drafts only by lowering and still further lowering the price.

The only real remedy consists in the reduction of the Home Charges. It is satisfactory to find that the Government of India is desirous of buying at home as much stores as it conveniently can and is encouraging the subordinate Governments to do the same. But it would be well for the Government of India to consider whether it could not buy all its stores at home rather than in England. We ourselves are convinced that it could, and that it would be wise to do so. Further, the Government ought to consider whether it could not make arrangements with regard, for example, to the payments which it has to make on naval and military account to the home Government. Surely it is not necessary to sell Council drafts for the sake of arranging these payments, at all events not for the settlement of the whole of them. There are clearly other ways in which the matter could be done—not as an exchange operation at all. The Government of India and the home authorities are constantly bewailing the difficulties caused by this question of exchange, and yet they obstinately refuse even to listen to any suggestion for reducing the Home Charges. It is absolutely beyond dispute that the Home Charges could be reduced, and very materially. In other directions there is room for considerable savings both in India and in England; and still more, there is great need for developing the resources of India. The Famine Fund, it is contended, has to be suspended, because there is no revenue available for keeping it up. But surely it would be possible to urge forward railway construction without coming upon the Government for the capital. The conversion of the rupee debt, Sir James Westland tells us, has saved 42 lakhs a year. It is a considerable saving, no doubt, and it would be a matter for much congratulation if economy on the same scale had been carried out in other directions. But we doubt very much whether the conversion of the rupee debt was altogether wise. For our part, we should far prefer a reduction in the sterling debt, and it seems to us that everything ought to be done to avoid adding to the sterling debt. Railway construction is necessary, for trade cannot expand without greater railway facilities. But railway construction would be effected at a great cost if it were only done by the raising of the capital in the United Kingdom. On the other hand, if the capital were raised in India in silver the benefit would be double; the country would be opened up and, at the same time, a new field of investment would be offered to thrifty Indians, while the Home Charges would not be increased. As we have pointed out above, India is handicapped by the closing of the mints in her competition with China and Japan, and she will undoubtedly feel that disadvantage severely if China is now opened up, and Chinese industry is really developed. India, therefore, needs every possible aid. She has an immense advantage inasmuch as she has the command of British capital and British skill, and also as she has so much railway communication which China has not. In China, it is to be hoped, railways will now be built rapidly. But India has a great start which she ought to keep by further construction of railways. There is plenty of capital in the country, and we do not doubt that there is plenty of enterprise likewise if only the Government will get rid of the notion that it is to be always and everywhere the Providence of India, and will allow private enterprise a fair and a free field.

T. LLOYD.

SIR C. DILKE ON INDIAN FINANCE.

A Correspondent of INDIA sends the following account of an interview with Sir C. Dilke, M.P.

"Sir Charles, I once read (not for interviewing purposes) 'Problems of Greater Britain,' in which you say that most of India's difficulties are financial. Do you think so still?"

"But everyone thinks so," was the energetic answer. "Finance is at the bottom of everything, even the worst side of Indian government, the police. Finance is the difficulty in the way of military expeditions, frontier fortifications, and all the rest. The highest authorities think these increasingly necessary; the financiers tell us it cannot be done, and the result is a perpetual conflict."

"Surely you would not yourself advocate an increase in Indian taxation. At present, that would mean an increased deficit."

"Taxation ought rather to be reduced than increased. There are certain readjustments, certain economies that might be carried out to India's advantage."

"I remember that in 'Problems of Greater Britain' you advocate the disbanding of the Presidency armies in Bengal and Madras."

"Well, these changes are begun. The separate Presidency commands were given up last year; the army corps system has been substituted—a reform which I may say I had asked for years, and which five successive Viceroys recommended."

"Will that effect a great saving?"

"It tends rather to bar increased expenditure by increasing efficiency. A saving might be made by abolishing the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras, and their Councils, altogether, and substituting ordinary Lieutenant-Governors."

"But a Lieutenant-Governor has a Council too?"

"Yes, but not such an expensive article as those of the Presidencies. We can get efficiency at a cheaper rate, and we ought. And another benefit would accrue: the patronage of the Civil Service would be increased. We should get rid of appointments kept for home patronage."

"Yes, but none of these seems to be a very large economy, Sir Charles."

"Added together, they would mount up; they are well worth attention as India's finances now stand. Then I consider our ecclesiastical expenditure indefensible; it costs a good deal."

"Would you deprive Thomas Atkins of the spiritual help and advice of the chaplain?"

"No, I would not. But army chaplains come under the head of military expenditure; I refer to the ordinary system which costs a good deal of money. Then another economy easy to effect is the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India. I think it does more harm than good."

"I should have thought that as the Secretary of State for India is a man who does not always pretend to any special knowledge of India until he takes office, the existence of a Council might be justified."

"I don't see it," was the emphatic answer. "True, most of the men who compose it have held high office in India; but then a man's knowledge quickly becomes out of date."

"Euphemism for a fossil—" But Sir Charles continued:

"Very often the Viceroy in Council is virtually overruled by the Council of the Secretary of State in London. One of the numerous things its members opposed was the abolition of the Presidency commands. But the biggest economy of all would be a change in the whole system of enlistment for the white army in India. I recommended this change in a little book I wrote with Mr. Spenser Wilkinson in 1892, 'Imperial Defence.' All the Indian authorities think that India might get greater efficiency for the same money, or the same efficiency for less money."

"What ails our system of enlistment?"

"It is not based solely on India's needs, but is a compromise between her needs and ours at home. We generally enlist men for seven years, or for eight if they serve in India and their service ends while they are there. We call it short service, though all other nations would call it very long. It suits neither us nor India. It suits us better than it suits India, but for infantry a three years' service would suit us better still. For example, in the case of the Guards, most of the men have three years' service, with older non-commissioned officers."

"You don't surely mean that India would prefer a shorter length of service, seeing that she has to pay the cost of transport, pay during transport, and all the rest?"

"I certainly don't mean that. India requires the eight year service *without deduction*, and she is a pretty long way from getting it."

"How so?"

"In England most men recruit below twenty (and have to stay in this country until they are over that age) often under special enlistment; 'special' because those taken fall short of the conditions in age, height, chest width and depth. Really they are growing lads. India does not thus get full value for her money, not the full eight years, as she ought to do. That period covers the maximum of efficiency."

"Serving less than eight years then adds to the cost of the army?"

"Yes. Left to herself, India could run her military system more cheaply than it is run for her. She has complaints about the supply of stores, guns, etc.; she pays the transport of men out and home, pays them on the way, pays a sum supposed to represent the cost of the training of recruits, pays full rates for pensions—a very costly army."

"Considering that food, and drink too, is cheap out there, might not one say the army is highly paid in India?"

"If our home system of enlistment were separate from that of India, and free exchange could be made, we should soon find out the rate of wages necessary to be paid for Indian service. The marines are a long-service force, and serve mostly abroad, yet there is no difficulty in getting recruits. I should be disposed to let men leave when they liked; very few would do so under right conditions. Most of them like service in India."

"Perhaps because they are not harassed with too much work."

"Certainly they have to work harder at home. In India, a good deal of work is done for them. A little more might prevent them from thinking of the heat so much. It is awful in the plains from May onwards. I've tried it. But it is not as a rule unhealthy for men who have plenty to occupy them."

"In 'Problems of Greater Britain' you discuss various sources of revenue which might be tried in India."

"Yes, and I quoted some which Sir J. Strachey advocates. He thinks half a million might be raised from licenses, and about the same from stamps. I look upon a tobacco *régie* as quite feasible; I don't think the difficulties of introduction are too great."

"India is so very poor. If there is any benefit to be derived from tobacco, it seems hard to debar poor people from it."

"But a *régie* might be worked so as not to be a tax on the poor. The poorer sorts of tobacco in France escape taxation, comparatively speaking. Europeans in India have now taken to smoking their own Indian cigars. Except for wealthy natives, the whole importation of Manilla tobacco has ceased."

"How much would a tobacco tax yield?"

"Impossible to say until the tax is tried, and a system decided upon. I believe Sir J. Strachey puts the tobacco *régie* at three or four millions. The Turks, for instance, have established agencies to push the sale of their tobaccoes abroad. I think that with more Government care in supervision, Indian cigars might get a great position. Indian tea might be pushed too. Outside England, it is scarcely known, and even we know much more about Ceylon."

"Perhaps the peculiarities of Indian orange pekoe might prove a drawback?"

"I don't think so. Remember Indian teas are very various, and a change in such matters is a good thing. There is a great tea market in the Dominion of Canada. Australia is a good market per head, but the population is small. The Americans drink fine teas with their lunch."

"Of course, India could only make money out of tea as an export?"

"That is my meaning. To return to Indian revenue, I am of opinion the great landowners get off too cheaply, and some of the native States pay us too little. The native States get great advantages over our parts of the country. We give them a lot of things which they do not have to pay for. They make up for this partly by deficiency caused by misgovernment—of course, I do not speak of all: some, Mysore for example, are excellent—partly by keeping up what *they* call Imperial service troops."

"Evidently, you don't."

"No; for this reason. I think they are not of much value to us. We have to employ troops in brigades of a certain proportion of whites and of natives. If you increase these Imperial service troops without increasing your white troops, you gain nothing. Some of the Imperial service troops are good, but they take the place of our native army if they can be used at all. They are officered partly by natives, but have a force of white officers. These Imperial service forces vary greatly, as do those generally of the Native Princes, from the Haidarabad contingent downwards."

"And I suppose the proportion of whites to natives is as the laws of the Medes and Persians, which alter not?"

Sir Charles raised his eyebrows. "There is a danger with mercenary troops. We and they have no common ties: our best troops are mercenaries. Take the Ghoorkas, for instance, who are recruited in Nepal, a State tributary to China. Why should the Ghoorkas remain loyal to us if things went wrong? Perhaps they are the first troops in the world, *as long as things go right*. But the Ghoorka is a foreigner, even to the people of British India."

"Then, on the whole, you think there is no objection to opening up fresh fields of taxation?"

"I prefer to advocate the measures of economy I have touched upon. They are necessary and would be more popular; especially is a different system of enlistment necessary."

"What is the average military expenditure in India?"

"It depends upon the rate of the rupee and upon the military expeditions which crop up. For a good few years the average has been about 17 millions sterling, including strategic roads, etc. This year there has been an increase on account of Chitral, but, of course, we cannot yet calculate how much. Strategic railways have also to be taken into account, for many railways made for strategic purposes are counted only as public works."

"And then India pays a large contribution to the maintenance of the navy."

"Oh no, a very small contribution; practically she gets it for nothing. There is not a case for a very large contribution to the navy, as India has not much sea-borne trade of her own. It is nearly all carried in British ships. Canada pays nothing, and yet she has a very large mercantile marine."

"I gather, Sir Charles, that you are not hostile to the Indian National Congress movement?"

"Far from it: it is the inevitable result of the seed we ourselves have sown. It is true the Congress is not thoroughly representative, but it is as representative as present circumstances will allow. The fact of its not being thoroughly representative ought not to blind us to the reasonableness, the wisdom of many of the Congress demands. British rule can only be strengthened by widening its base."

And I took my leave much impressed with the fact that Sir Charles had all his subject and everything pertaining to it right in the front of his mind, although he is so deep in amendments to the Factory Bill now before the House of Commons, that he might well have been pardoned had India and the Colonies been relegated, for the time, to a subordinate position.

There can (said the writer of "Indian Affairs" in the *Times* of April 8th) be no question either in India or in England as to the immediate duty of relieving Dr. Robertson. But there seem to be very serious questions in regard to the policy which has allowed a British frontier officer to place himself in a position which, in the opinion of experienced Indian critics, he should never have occupied and from which it will cost the Indian taxpayer some two millions sterling to extricate him. Even a loyal supporter of the Government like the *Pioneer* feels compelled, in a closely-reasoned article, to protest against what "seems to be in truth a melancholy confession of political incompetency."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

APRIL, 1895.

Blackwood's Magazine (37, Paternoster Row, E.C.). Wolseley, Major-General Sir George B., "Our Indian Frontier."

Cosmopolitan. Shufeldt, R. W., "Beauty from an Indian's Point of View."

Chambers's Journal (W. and R. Chambers). "The Great Indian Survey."

Contemporary Review (Isbister and Co.) "The Railway to India."

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). Desai, J. V., "Indian Women as Wives and Widows." "Ratanbai: A Sketch of a Bombay School Girl's Home Life" (Serial).

Journal of the Royal United Service Institution. Gough, Sir Charles J. S., "Battles of Chillianwallah and Goojerat."

Minster. Temple, Sir R., "Recollections of Great Men in India."

National Review (Allen and Co., 14 Waterloo Place, S.W.) "The Currency Question," Symposium on.

New Review. Keary, C. F., "Impressions of India."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

APRIL, 1895.

Macpherson, J. M. ...."Lists of British Enactments in Force in Native States." (Government Printing Office, Calcutta.)..	Rs. 5.
Rowntree, Joshua............"The Opium Habit in the East." (P. S. King and Son.)	— —
Stanford, Edward..........."Stanford's Sketch Map of the North-West Frontier of India from Peshawur to the Pamirs."...........	— —
"Map of the Pamirs and adjacent territory."	2s. 6d.
Braddon, Sir E., K.C.M.G.........."Thirty years of Shikar." (William Blackwood and Sons.)	18s. 0d.
"Special War Map of the North-West Frontier of India showing British Operations in Chitral." (John Bartholomew and Co., Edinburgh.)..	1s. 0d.
"Map to Illustrate the Chitral Expedition in North-West India." (W. and A. K. Johnston.)..	1s. 6d.
"Wyld's Military Staff Map of Central Asia." (G. W. Bacon and Co.)	10s. 0d.
"The Indian Textile Journal Directory of Indian Manufactories, 1895. Edited by John Wallace, C.E., compiled by Sorabji M. Rutnagur. Bombay: Caxton Steam Printing Works...	— —

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, MAY, 1895.

THE "FORWARD" FRONTIER POLICY.

I.—CHITRAL RELIEVED: WHAT NEXT?

By SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

As Dr. Robertson has been rescued, and Umra Khan is a fugitive, we are now at liberty to ask the Government, what is to be the next scene in the trans-frontier drama? Had the relief party been too late, or had any serious disaster overtaken our troops among the defiles, we should doubtless have been launched upon an indefinite career of mountain warfare. But fortune has been very kind to Her Majesty's Ministers, so that they have not only passed safely through a most perilous crisis, but, in the strong position they now occupy, they have the opportunity of reconsidering the whole situation. And I earnestly trust that they will see their way to end these frontier aggressions, and return to the sound policy of Lord Lawrence, which was based upon respect for the rights of others, and which secured to us friendly neighbours on the frontier, a full treasury, and a contented people throughout India. The present expedition has indeed been an object lesson which must have made clear, even to the least observant and to the most prejudiced, the futility, the danger and the costliness of this marvellous policy of adventure, which has landed us in the present complications; which thinks to strengthen our position on the frontier by locating British officers at isolated points in this mountainous wilderness, where they are at the mercy of wild tribes, and far away from all support; with the result that we have to send a whole army corps two hundred miles in order to save their lives, and extricate them from the trap in which they are caught. Surely no scheme could be devised better calculated to lower our reputation, dissipate our resources, and produce chaos along our frontiers.

Now that the British Officers are safe Government has a free hand; and the action as regards the particular case of Chitral is mainly important as disclosing the principles upon which trans-frontier affairs will be conducted in the future. It will be remembered that the first object of the expedition, as stated by the Viceroy, was to rescue Dr. Robertson. But in the Proclamation addressed to the Border Tribes prior to the commencement of the operations, the Viceroy set forth a further object, and gave a definite promise. He said:

> "The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present and prevent any future unlawful aggression on Chitral territory, and as soon as this object has been attained the force will be withdrawn. The Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territories through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interference with the independence of the tribes."

Now it appears that the flight of both Umra Khan and Sher Afzul has put an end to any present unlawful aggression on Chitral territory. But what is the nature of the measures by which such aggression is to be prevented in the future? This is a question of the utmost importance, for the nature of the measures will indicate the future course of action, whether in accordance with the wise policy of Lord Lawrence, or in continuation of the recent policy of adventure and aggression which has brought us into these political and financial straits. The question is one demanding the most earnest consideration of Her Majesty's Government. For how can future unlawful aggression on Chitral territory be effectually prevented except by occupying Chitral in force? And how can Chitral be occupied in force without keeping permanently open a road for wheeled traffic to Peshawur, a distance of 180 miles? So formidable an undertaking would inevitably lead to wholesale annexations and a vast expenditure.

It is the besetting sin of Liberal Governments when in office to shirk the duty of reversing a mischievous policy, and of enforcing in foreign and Indian affairs the good principles they professed when in opposition. With the strong forces of official opinion to struggle against, a Liberal

Minister finds it so much easier and more pleasant to accept the doctrine of continuity in administration. This suits our opponents exactly, especially when the policy is a risky one. It is then a case of "heads I win, tails you lose." If the venture ends successfully our opponents justly claim the credit of it, and make the success a ground for further encroachments. If, on the other hand, there is disaster they have the satisfaction of denouncing the incapacity of a Liberal Administration, and showing that it failed because it did not go far enough. In this trans-frontier question there is, at the present crisis, a choice of Hercules, a separation of two ways; and I trust that Ministers will not hesitate boldly to choose the better path. What then are the two courses which can be pursued? Briefly stated, the policy of Lord Lawrence and the school of practical statesmen associated with his name was to keep within the natural boundaries of India. Nature has kindly provided India to the North West with a mountain rampart, and has moreover manned that rampart with volunteer defenders, the wild and warlike tribes who alone can exist in these inhospitable regions; whose one valued possession is their independence; and who are prepared to defend that possession with their lives. What the nature of that mountain barrier is, how great the distances, how high the snowy passes, how deep and rapid the torrents, how rocky and inaccessible the defiles, and how brave its defenders, has been made very familiar to us during the last month by the daily telegrams from the seat of war. The policy of Lord Lawrence was to maintain that barrier, and to leave its brave defenders in the enjoyment of their cherished independence. This is a policy which commends itself to commonsense. When a farmer has a thick and thorny hedge round his orchard, he naturally preserves that hedge and regards the thorns and briars as his best defence against the thieves who would steal his fruit. To spend his substance in removing the thorns and making great gaps in the fence would surely be the height of folly. If there happen to be hornets' nests in the recesses of this hedge why should he go and get himself stung? Had he not better leave the hornets where they are in order that they may sting the thieves? The advisers who will not allow him to let well alone are his worst enemies. Similarly in India, any departure from the safe, wise, and humane policy of Lord Lawrence can bring nothing but ruin both political and financial. How does it profit us to shoot down the tribesmen who keep watch and ward in the fastnesses a hundred miles beyond our frontier? And can anything be more imbecile than to make invasion easy by spending vast sums in constructing roads through these wilds, thus paving the way for an invader? What does past experience teach us? It teaches us that nothing but good has ever come from Lord Lawrence's policy. All our frontier disasters, from the first Afghan war downwards, have been directly caused by some departure from those principles. On each occasion, when disaster has befallen us, we have for a time recognised the folly of the enterprises which have involved us in bloodshed and disgrace. But on each occasion the lesson has soon been forgotten. The restless professional instincts of a great army maintained in a high state of efficiency, and pining for distinction, keep official public opinion in India always in favour of an advance, and the military bureaucracy at Simla has always proved too strong for any control exercised from home. They can always bide their time till they find a Viceroy or a Secretary of State pliant to their will, or till a Russian scare allows them to carry out the schemes they are perpetually hatching. Thus it happens that our best Viceroys, like Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook, and Lord Ripon, can do little more than put off the evil day until successors are found unwilling or unable to control the adventurous spirits by whom they are surrounded. I do not wish to be misunderstood in this matter. I cast no reflection upon our Indian military officers, among whom I have many of my best friends. On the contrary I fully recognise the fact that our army would not be fit for its duties if the men were not eager for active service and opportunities for distinction. If I keep a watch-dog to defend my house it is no dispraise of him to say that his jaws are strong and his teeth sharp, and that he is willing enough to use them. At the same time it is my duty to keep him on the chain, and to see that he only bites the right persons. He cannot be trusted to make the selection for himself. And so it is in the case of John Bull and his dogs of war. He alone is responsible for letting them loose. He must see that they do not put their teeth into the wrong persons, and it will be no sufficient excuse to say that all military opinion was in favour of the attack. As I will show presently, even military opinion is by no means unanimous in favour of these disastrous innovations. These new-fangled enterprises, of which Chitral is a good example, are called a "forward" policy. I say they are a backward policy as regards the safety of our Indian Empire, because they destroy our natural defences, dissipate our resources, and alienate our friends.

Let us consider very briefly the arguments put forward by Lord Roberts, who is by far the most important and responsible public man who favours the aggressive policy. In the *Times* of 13th April he sets forth his case. He calls Lord Lawrence's methods obsolete, and commends the policy "adopted of late years." Let us see how he proves the necessity of the change, and how he justifies his bold assertion that had Lord Lawrence been alive he would have approved the altered policy. He first gives a description of the border tribes, as being practically independent, and inhabiting the mountainous region with which our frontier is coterminous from Quetta to a point 100 miles north of Gilghit, some 600 miles as the crow flies. These tribes, he tells us, can muster a quarter of a million of fighting men, armed with guns and rifles, many of them of modern patterns, and he describes them as extremely fanatical, but hardy and brave, and excellent soldiers when disciplined. He further declares that upon the attitude of these tribes the successful defence of India will in great measure depend; that they must be dealt with as a weapon of the utmost value to that side which can secure their co-operation; and that we should strengthen our cordial relations with them in order to "ensure their helping us to make the necessary preparations for maintaining their own independence." All this is excellent, but it suggests no departure from Lord Lawrence's policy. On the contrary the whole argument tells against these aggressive frontier schemes. If we base our hopes of friendly co-operation upon the determination of these tribes to preserve their independence, we surely should not begin operations by ourselves depriving them of that independence, and shooting them down if they prefer to remain free. Lord Roberts asks whether it is wise to leave these tribes to intrigue against us, and to present such valuable fighting materials to our opponents? To this I would reply that the spectacle of the Baluch tribes, the Waziris, the Hunza-Nagars absorbed by us is the strongest incentive we could give to the remaining border tribes to intrigue with our enemies in order to maintain the independence which their neighbours have lost. The only real way of conciliating the good will of these wild tribes is to convince them that we do not want their wretched country, and would not take it as a gift; and this is inconsistent with a policy of aggression. Certainly we do not wish to present these fighting materials to our opponents, but the most certain way of doing this is to threaten their independence. As Dr. Leitner has well said in a letter to the *Morning Post*, "the first invader is the enemy, the second is the deliverer."

This is the whole of the case, as stated by Lord Roberts. But let it not be supposed that even military opinion is unanimous. Curiously enough in the very same issue of the *Times* there appear, alongside of Lord Roberts's communication, letters from two other general officers of large experience, Sir Neville Chamberlain and Lord Chelmsford, who are entirely opposed to Lord Roberts's aggressive schemes. Sir N. Chamberlain, who commanded in the Ambeyla Campaign and spent many years in Afghanistan and on the frontier, regards our Chitral difficulties as the "inevitable outcome of the system introduced within the last few years," a system which has "brought about the unprovoked invasion of the territory of independent neighbouring tribes with whom we have no quarrel and with whom we have in late years lived on fairly friendly terms." This reads unpleasantly in connection with the telegrams we have been in the habit of reading from day to day, which recount how we "demolished a village or two," as part of a morning's work; how "the fire of the artillery and maxim-guns was very destructive"; how "the mountain guns speedily got the range and shell after shell burst among the natives"; and how "the enemy were compelled to give way before the furious fire that was poured into them, and suffered very heavily." Surely some sympathy must be felt for these brave men with whom "we have no quarrel," and whose only offence is that of defending their territory and homes from a foreign invader. In any case it will be admitted that such proceedings are a strange way of "strengthening our cordial relations" with these tribes, upon whose attitude, Lord Roberts tells us, "the successful defence of India will in great measure depend."

W. Wedderburn.

II.—LORD ROBERTS AND INDIAN FRONTIER DEFENCE.

By J. Dacosta.

Lord Roberts's letter, published in the *Times* of April 12, contains statements and expressions of opinion which are remarkable for their inconsistency with the opinions which his lordship previously entertained and has never publicly repudiated or qualified. For instance, it is stated in that letter that:

> "One can approve the feeling of repugnance with which thirty years ago many distinguished men viewed any unnecessary communication being held with the border tribes. Russia was still separated from Afghanistan by hundreds of miles of barren steppes. . . . . With Oriental avarice the Afghan tribes are ready to accept money from both England and Russia, while awaiting the development of hostilities; and there is the possibility, if left alone by us, of their joining our opponents at the outset by the promise of loot in India."

Let us compare these statements with the following extract from General Sir Frederick Roberts's despatch dated Kabul, May 29, 1880:

> "We have nothing to fear from Afghanistan, and the best thing to do is to leave it as much as possible to itself. It may not be flattering to our *amour propre*, but I feel sure that I am right when I say that the less the Afghans see of us the less they will dislike us. Should Russia in future years attempt to conquer Afghanistan or invade India through it, we should have a better chance of attaching the Afghans to our interests if we avoid all interference with them in the meantime."

The inconsistency mentioned above will at once appear, especially when it is remembered that the Kabul despatch was written not thirty years ago when hundreds of miles separated Russia from Afghanistan, but only some fourteen years ago when Russia had conquered the intervening Khanates and occupied almost the same position as that which she now holds. It seems difficult, therefore, to account for opinions so diametrically opposed as those which are affirmed in the two extracts having emanated from the same mind.

Lord Roberts also says in his letter to the *Times* with reference to a Russian advance:

> "The border lands, which will form the first theatre of operations must be made accessible to us by roads the construction of which, as has so often been proved, materially assists us in securing the good will of the people of the soil."

His Lordship does not state where, by constructing roads, we so often secured the good will of the people. In the borderlands of Afghanistan, at all events, the experience of the Indian Government points exactly in the opposite direction. Ill-will and active hostility have everywhere, from Waziristan in the south to Swat and Buner in the north, been the effect produced by our constructing military roads through tribal territories; and our roads, generally speaking, were injured or destroyed by the people when our troops evacuated the country —a fact which will be found stated in the reports of our frontier officers both civil and military. Moreover, in the Kabul despatch of May, 1880, Sir F. Roberts emphatically condemned the folly of British troops crossing the frontier and penetrating the mountainous region of Afghanistan in order to close with a Russian army marching on India. His deep conviction on this point was manifest in the studiously precise terms which he used for expressing it in the following passage of his despatch:

> "The longer and more difficult the line of communication is, the more numerous and greater the obstacles which Russia would have to overcome; and so far from shortening one mile of the road, I would let the web of difficulties extend to the very mouth of the Khaiber."

It is sad to find Lord Roberts coming forward now to support a policy which he so uncompromisingly condemned when his recent experience in the Afghan war had enabled him to form a well-grounded opinion on the subject. To judge from the letters of other officers on the same subject, which were simultaneously or subsequently published in the *Times*, the policy of subjugating the independent tribes who dwell along the north-western frontier of India appears to be strongly condemned by our military experts, and no military authority, except Lord Roberts, has come forward to approve it. In order to form a correct opinion of the frontier policy which is being pursued in India, it is necessary to remember that every attempt which has been made during the last eighteen years to carry that policy into effect has signally failed, and that the military operations undertaken for the purpose, together with the subsidies paid to numberless tribal leaders for inducing the submission of the foe, while they resulted in an appalling sacrifice of blood and treasure and a serious loss of prestige, failed to secure the smallest advantage in return. Under these untoward conditions common prudence prompts that the policy in question and the possibility of executing it should once more be carefully considered by the nation before the deplorable results which it has already produced are further aggravated through irrational persistence.

The policy originated in the late Sir H. Rawlinson's Memorandum of 1865 advocating the advance of British troops with British agents in Central Asia, as a check to Russian progress in those regions. It was insidiously alleged at the same time—doubtless in order to create a plea for spending Indian revenue in the undertaking—that the scheme would protect India against an attack from the great Northern Power. The Government of India, on being consulted on the subject, strongly condemned the scheme on the grounds specified in their despatch of January 4, 1869, the following passages in which deserve particular attention:

> "We solicit a full consideration of the subjoined Minutes. Your Grace will observe that regard has been paid to the division and conflict of parties in Afghanistan and to the peculiar national characteristics of the people; to the difficulties of establishing, supporting and supplying troops in isolated positions and at a distance from our own territories; to the financial outlay which any strategic advance beyond our own border would certainly entail; and to the probable effects of such measures on the feelings and wishes of those classes of Her Majesty's subjects in India whom it is our object to attach to us by just treatment or, if necessary, to control by salutary awe. These considerations deserve fully as much attention as the gradual advance of Russia in Central Asia. We object to any active interference in the affairs of Afghanistan by the deputation of a British officer with or without a contingent, or by the forcible or amicable occupation of any post or tract of country beyond our own frontier, inasmuch as such a measure would engender irritation, defiance and hatred, in the minds of the Afghans, without in the least strengthening our power for attack or defence. We think it impolitic and unwise to decrease any of the difficulties which would be entailed on Russia if that Power seriously thought of invading India, as we should certainly decrease them if we left our own frontier and met her half way in a difficult country and possibly in the midst of a hostile and exasperated population. We foresee no limits to the expenditure which such a move might require, and we protest against the necessity of having to impose additional taxation on India; and we think that the objects which we have at heart, in common with all interested in India, may be attained by an attitude of readiness and firmness on our frontier, and by expending all our resources for the attainment of practical and sound ends over which we can exercise an effective and immediate control."

Notwithstanding these very cogent objections, the Secretary of State for India adopted the "forward policy" in January, 1875, when Lord Salisbury, writing to the Viceroy on the 22nd of that month, said:—

> "Though no immediate danger appears to threaten the interests of Her Majesty in those regions [Central Asia], the

> aspect of affairs is sufficiently grave to suggest the necessity of timely precaution. I have, therefore, to instruct you to take measures for procuring the assent of the Amír to the establishment of a British agency at Herat. When this is accomplished, it may be desirable to take a similar step with regard to Kandahar. I do not suggest any similar step with respect to Kabul, as I am sensible of the difficulties which are interposed by the fanatic violence of the people. An English agency at Herat will be an indication of the English solicitude for the safety of our allies."

This despatch clearly shows that the aim of the new policy was not to protect India from any existing or threatening danger, but to promote what the British Ministry in 1875 (shortly before the breaking out of hostilities between Russia and Turkey) assumed to be Her Majesty's interests in Central Asia. When war, therefore, became necessary for the execution of that policy, constitutional usage required that Parliament should be asked for the needed supplies—a course intended to impose on the Ministers of the Crown the wholesome obligation of justifying their policy in Parliament before they involved the nation in war. That important obligation, however, was eluded in 1878 through the appropriation of Indian revenue to defray the expenses of the Afghan war; and the same irregular proceeding was adopted with respect to every subsequent trans-frontier military operation undertaken by the Government of India. This course of action also violated the 21 and 22 Vic., c. 106, sec. 55, in which it is laid down that:

> "Except for preventing or repelling actual invasion of Her Majesty's Indian possessions or under sudden or urgent necessity, the revenues of India shall not, without the consent of both Houses of Parliament, be applicable to defray the expenses of any military operation carried on beyond the external frontiers of such possessions by H.M. forces charged upon such revenues."

That no sudden or urgent necessity existed when the above provision of the Act for the better government of India was deliberately disregarded, was shown in the Prime Minister's speech on Lord Mayor's day, 1878, when he said:

> "So far as the invasion of India in that quarter is concerned, it is the opinion of Her Majesty's Government that it is hardly practicable. The base of operations of any possible foe is so remote, the communications are so difficult, the aspect of the country so forbidding, that we have long arrived at the opinion that an invasion of our empire by passing the mountains which form our North-Western frontier is one which we need not dread."

In conclusion, let me call the attention of the readers of INDIA to the grave fact that an unwise and most unfortunate policy, inaugurated and prosecuted through unconstitutional means, has produced results the most disastrous—results which may be summarised as follows:

I. The unsuccessful Afghan war commenced in 1878 and the humiliating conditions submitted to in July and August, 1880, for bringing that war to a close;

II. The equally unsuccessful expeditions subsequently employed for the subjugation of the border lands of Afghanistan;

III. An enormous addition to the Indian debt;

IV. Deep discontent throughout India caused by oppressive taxation imposed for defraying military charges; and

V. Our present critical situation in India, with regard to Chitral.

These results justify in a remarkable manner the objections to the "forward policy" which were so strongly urged in the Indian Government despatch of January 4, 1869; and the persistence of the Secretary of State in adopting in 1875, and in subsequently maintaining, a course of action which both reason and experience had shown to be unsound and disastrous, would not have been possible but for the virtual irresponsibility to Parliament which that Minister acquired, in a great measure, through the sacrifice of Indian interests which it was his duty to protect. J. DACOSTA.

III.—THE ANGLO-RUSSIAN AGREEMENT AND CHITRAL.

BY AN EX-DIPLOMATIST.

It cannot be sufficiently impressed on the natives of India that the ruinous expenditure which the expedition to Chitral involves is due to Russia insisting on England giving a tangible proof of her influence right up to the limit now fixed for her sphere by the Pamirs agreement. This explains why war was commenced on the 1st April, when it was only on that date that our ultimatum, the receipt of which by Umra Khan has not been proved, enjoined on that freebooter to leave Chitral, so that no time was given to see whether he carried out our wishes or not. This is also why we were prepared to push on for Chitral even if Dr. Robertson had been relieved before now. That he should have refused to evacuate the Chitral fort or to come to terms with Sher Afzul, the rightful claimant to Chitral, on the puerile ground of an insolent letter from the latter, is another proof in the same direction. As with Chilas, it was necessary to provoke the Chitralis into resistance, with the view of the assertion of our power, on which Russian diplomacy threw a doubt, so as to compel us to bore through the various ranges of mountains at *our* expense and in *her* eventual interests as the deliverer of tribes, among whom *vendetta* for the relatives that we have slaughtered is a sacred duty that can only be deferred till the opportunity arises for its fulfilment. Just as Oksakoff's mission to Kabul was answerable for the war with that country, just as the few hundred roubles given by the Russian Geographical Society to Colonel Grombcheffsky to intrigue with Hunza involved us in the wanton campaign for the subjugation of Hunza-Nagar, so also have the nibblings of Colonel Yonoff and others on the Pamirs drawn attention to the hitherto unknown countries between Peshawur and the Oxus, with the result of inflicting an irreparable blow on the finances and the contentment of India. When history comes to be written, not by servile officials but by independent enquirers, it will be found that no more unjust series of wars has ever been waged than that which, beginning with the practical annexation of Kashmir under false pretences and the disposal of its treasure, trampled on our own traditions of not extending our sway beyond the Indus in that direction. No wonder that the silence of the agents that provoked the massacres at Chilas and Hunza has been purchased by promotion and decorations.

I trust that the Liberal party will not refrain from a thorough enquiry into the causes of the Chitral Expedition, simply because it is a Liberal Ministry under which it so happens that this war has taken place. We cannot sufficiently urge the evacuation of all districts now occupied, or in course of occupation, by our troops, as soon as the objects avowed in our proclamation to the tribes, namely, the withdrawal of Umra Khan from Chitral and the relief of Dr. Robertson, have been achieved. If there is anything even more detestable than the Jingoism that now again is seeking to pick a quarrel with the Amír of Afghanistan by accusing him of having allowed Sher Afzul to escape, it will be the subservience of Radicals to party when the great principles they represent are at stake. Expediency, no less than humanity, bids us to have done with the slaughter of unoffending tribes or with their costly subjugation. On this subject the letter of the veteran hero of Ambeyla, Sir Neville Chamberlain, in the *Times* of the 23rd ultimo, may well be contrasted in its sober and thoughtful treatment of a subject of which he is *facile princeps*, with the vapourings of Mr. Vambéry in the same issue. If ever it has become clear to the careful reader that this Professor was a Jingo Agent rather than a person really acquainted with the diplomacy of the Central Asian question since the Granville-Gortschakoff Convention of 1872, it is when he congratulates England in general and Lord Roberts in particular on the Chitral expedition, *as opposed to Russian encroachments*, when it really *invites* the Russians to come as deliverers of practically unarmed tribes that, without the faintest sense of chivalry, we have been decimating with our Maxim guns. The Swatis are a physically weak, and morally timid, race and among them most were on our side. Bajaur had been practically won over long ago by our presents to its religious and other leaders and by our sowing disunion among its chiefs; but there still remain the more formidable Buneris and the Mohmands to reckon with, if we should remain near their territories after the capture of Chitral. What an irony on our expensive operations, intended to practice our troops and new weapons on the *corpus vile* of the natives of the intermediate Anglo-Russian zone, to remember that *we* did not, after all, either turn out Umra Khan from Chitral or relieve Dr. Robertson, for it was to the Khan of Dîr (whom we had originally encouraged Umra Khan to dispossess) that we owe both the final collapse of Umra Khan and the relief of Dr. Robertson. Indeed, had peace or economy been our object, all and more than has been achieved could have been gained by friendly overtures, but our aim was a war at all cost and in defiance of all principle. The questions asked in Parliament either meet with evasive answers or are frustrated on some technical point known to the official "devil's advocate." What is required is a Parliamentary Enquiry into the whole series of criminal blunders beginning with the reoccupation of the Gilghit Residency. To pose now as the asserters of the rights of Kashmir or Chitral merely adds insult to the injury that we have inflicted on both countries, is a pretext laughed at by the tribes, and is contradicted by the simple fact that Kashmir did not call in the British troops at all, but was made to contribute its own quota to the expedition by the Paramount Power.

IV.—THE DARK SHADOW BEHIND CHITRAL.

By An Anglo-Indian.

Whilst the London press is revelling in the luxury of columns of "ready copy" with sensational news from the Hindu Kush, and newsboys shout "Great Fight with Umra Khan," "Brilliant Military Feat by Colonel Kelly," "Chitral Garrison Relieved," and so on, there is much more serious matter for thought in the minds of public men who cherish any sense of responsibility. No man who claims to come under this category has now any right, in respect of the great imperial question now pressed on us, to excuse his inertness by the indolent plea that he "does not know what it is all about." Such men ought to know, even if they have only thought over the subject since February, when it has been forced on the public mind by the signal breakdown of the Indian Government's infatuated policy, pursued far beyond the boundaries of India, during the last fifteen years. In the copious telegrams spread before them for nearly three months past—which are in some degree a credit to the effective journalism of our day—supplemented as these have been by duly edited official statements from the India Office, there has been matter enough on which they could form a judgment and seek for further information.

This, in most needful details, has been forthcoming in the columns of the *Times*. Men such as

Lord Roberts, who are eager to "praise the bridge that has brought them over" and landed them in honours and decorations, have to the best of their ability set out such explanations and apologies as they can find on behalf of the reckless policy of meddling and invasion in the barren mountains of Afghanistan and High Asia. This now stands condemned by its dismal and disastrous failure—that not at the cost of England, but of the helpless and unfortunate people of India. On the other hand, men of far more experience and weight than that of the abettors of these revolutionary aggressions of the Indian Government and the India Office, have had their say to sufficient extent to leave our own public men without excuse for delaying to grapple with the wantonly invited peril that still confronts the British Empire in the East. Civilians such as Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir James Lyall, with others of equal weight (who have reserved their names); and men of large military and political experience such as General Neville Chamberlain, Major Raverty, Colonel Brownlow, and General Charles Gough, have fairly placed the other side of the shield before the hitherto supine British public, more especially in the *Times* of April 12th and 13th. To those spontaneous communications, if there were no other material, we can fairly appeal as affording conclusive condemnation of the unspeakable folly of the long series of political intrigue and military aggressions that have been carried on *outside* of India during the last decade and a-half, whilst glowing versions of "the moral and material progress" of that Empire have been officially published.

In other columns will be found selections from those convincing protests. At present I only propose to make a few comments on the remarkable letter by "An Expert," to which the *Times* gave its due significance of large type in its issue of the 13th ult. This contribution to the real burning question of the day is studiously moderate in tone. At several points it indicates that the writer thinks more deeply than he cares to avow, and that he could speak more strongly if he had permission. In passing, one may invite him so to do. His opening remark is of immediate practical moment. It is to the effect that it will be much to be regretted if the "exciting scenes" in the Hindu Kush regions should be allowed to "monopolise our attention, and cause us to lose sight of the far more important question of which Chitral is merely a branch—namely, the general trans-frontier policy of the Government of India." This admonition cannot be too closely heeded just now. General Sir Robert Low's big army has given, and will give a good account of itself. As "An Expert" remarks: "General Low will, we may confidently hope, reach Chitral in time [though Colonel Kelly may be in first]. It is then that our real difficulties will begin." To this I may respond, those "difficulties" began and were deliberately invited years ago—as already explained ten times over in these columns. This division of that demented and disastrous course, which, under successive Secretaries of State, the Indian Government has been weakly permitted to pursue, began in or about 1890. It was under the Secretaryship of Viscount Cross and the Viceroyalty of the Marquis of Lansdowne, when—the resources and troops of Kashmir having been seized for the purpose—expeditions were sent up to the foot of the Pamirs, and the independence of Hunza, Nagar, Gilghit, and the rest were destroyed, the Indian Government's Residents being placed in charge. Though Chitral was under no subjection to Kashmir, it was in like manner, though by special political chicanery, brought under subjection to Simla, and our puppet Mehtar set up—with the result we now see.

The lessons of experience so wilfully disregarded in the case of Chitral, a "mere branch" of the Indian Government's malign aggressive policy, are referred to with much force in "Expert's" fourth paragraph, which opens thus—"It seems to be assumed that the Indian Government has been taken by surprise. I cannot believe this to be possible:" and towards the close of the same telling passage, he again says—"I altogether refuse to believe that the Indian Government was so blind and unstatesmanlike as not to have seen the possible consequence of its policy." Here, however, with due deference to "An Expert" I venture to remark that in his seclusion, he can scarcely have kept an eye on the plots and scheming that have gone on at Simla—and, I fear, nearer home—during the last dozen years or more. Nor does he allow for the infatuation that besets men who find themselves left with irresponsible, and, virtually unlimited departmental power, while the higher and responsible authorities who should have controlled them, have slumbered, or alternately abetted and condoned their abuse of that secret, but too effective power. It is not too much to say that when—perhaps in the year 1900—the now carefully hidden records and despatches of the Simla Political Department's proceedings shall be dragged into daylight, it will be seen that transactions have been carried on, similar, in political turpitude and constitutional iniquity, to those that, in the sixteenth century, cost Strafford his head. But in these days whilst vital matters of State policy are obscured by the futility of Parliamentary debates, our jurists have lost touch of their constitutional functions; so that some of the more serious offences against statutory law and the interests of the community go unpunished, and, as in the case of these secret transgressions committed under that *Nominis et umbra* we call Indian Government, seldom meet with so much as formal rebuke.

It is in this direction that "An Expert" is far too reserved and confiding. Perhaps it is too much to expect that, even after years of personal freedom, he should be able to rise above the habits and instinct of official subordination. He remarks, incidentally, that "it would be rash to offer a final opinion (as to interference in the domestic affairs of Chitral) until we know all the facts of the case." And he is so humble-minded as to plead that "At present the Government only is in possession of the necessary information." While this affords undesigned evidence of the entire sincerity of the writer, it says little for his continuous observation of recent and current means of assessing "all the facts of the case"—whether applying to Beluchistan on the south, to Afghanistan on the west, or High Asia on the north. As to this latter division, that, for instance, was specifically exposed at the time in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review;* while, as to the rest, the successive steps in the intriguing, grasping, and aggressive schemes of the Simla politico-military conspirators, those have been continuously revealed, often furtively, sometimes ostentatiously in two journals, one here and the other in India. To the few who could read between the lines, these unauthorised, but too authentic *communiqués* have told "all the facts of the case" needed to form a decisive judgment on the policy which has landed the Indian Government in deficit and disaster. Meanwhile, the text of despatches, minutes and orders, which would have sufficed to fix responsibility have been systematically withheld. The true political side of the shield has been kept dark; while the shining and decorated side has been exhibited to bemuse and deceive the British public. To these two opposite causes—the systematic suppression of authentic records, and the cunningly contrived versions which tell only half the truth and that to misrepresent it—must be attributed the torpidity and inertness shown by our public men, including the average member of Parliament, in presence of this crisis.

Let us revert to "An Expert." His own sound judgment and good sense are obscured by his almost superstitious belief in the value of official information persistently bottled up. For instance, he seems to suppose it possible there may be "reasons and motives which actuated the Indian Government" that may go to prove that it "is wise to annihilate the defences which nature has furnished us against the invader by opening out . . . . this barren country by forming depôts of supplies and by constructing military roads through those pathless wastes." This is a brief and tolerably full description of the unspeakable folly that took the Indian Government's troops beyond the Himalaya—which have now dragged a whole army division after them. Of course "An Expert" is too well behaved to stamp on that folly; he only says he has "grave doubts," and meekly asks for "further information." Information, indeed! Yes: parliament, the country, and possibly the Courts of Law have yet to be informed who and what are the men, who, in defiance of the Statute of 1858 and in utter scorn of Parliamentary control, have wantonly destroyed the natural defences of India by going outside of them; and who in pursuance of this insensate course have squandered tens of millions of those resources on which the very existence of the Indian population depends. Further "information" also, as I have already hinted, is needed to show who and what are the higher authorities here who have permitted and abetted the Simla and other active offenders in their lawless course. Now, if "An Expert" will, for once, overcome his undue modesty and point out these obstinate or guilty wreckers inside the British-Indian commonwealth, he will do inestimable service to the Empire.

There are only two other points in this suggestive letter to which I can refer. The writer warns all concerned that the "new" frontier policy "may involve us in the most costly and tedious operations which we have taken since the suppression of the Mutiny." Here, again, "An Expert" is somewhat behind the time. This "new" policy outside of India has been going on—with some slight check in 1882-4—for eighteen years past. As to cost of the Mutiny, that used to be reckoned at forty to fifty millions: but the destructive policy now exposed has already cost nearly twice that awful sum—though, as England has only paid a trifling five millions towards that wicked waste, our governing classes here care next to nothing about that criminal waste of other people's money. The other point is that the writer exposes the "demarcation" delusion. He shows that the boundary pillars are fudge, except so far as they will be followed by cantonments (already being laid out in Waziristan); and that involves annexation, as onerous as it is costly.

For the rest, one may ask any sceptics or doubters regarding this urgent question of our time to read, learn, and inwardly digest the statements and arguments of General Sir Neville Chamberlain in the *Times* of April 23rd. AN ANGLO-INDIAN.

V.—AN APPEAL TO LANCASHIRE.

In view of the meeting of the National Reform Union, announced to be held at Manchester on May 1, the following "open letter" to the electors of Lancashire may be not inopportune:

> "What you want is a new and a wiser and a broader policy, and that policy, I much fear, you will never have from the Government of Calcutta, until the people of England say that it is their policy and must be adopted."—JOHN BRIGHT.

TO THE ELECTORS OF LANCASHIRE.

Fellow Citizens,—Your newspapers have been telling you during the past few weeks of the War in Chitral, and the gallantry and courage of British and Indian soldiers in cutting their way through the warlike tribes that separated them from your fellow-countryman Dr. Robertson.

You have admired, and admired rightly, the unfailing courage of our troops, but have you asked yourselves what business we have in Chitral at all, or what advantage is to be gained from this expedition and from the far-reaching policy in which it is but the latest incident?

THE POVERTY OF INDIA.

You know—for the recent imposition of duties on cotton goods imported into India has brought the fact home to you—that Indian finances are in a grievously embarrassed condition. Have you asked yourselves what must be the cost of these fruitless expeditions beyond the frontier, and whether the import duties are likely to be abolished while this drain upon the resources of the impoverished Indian taxpayer is permitted to continue?

Let us glance back at the origin of this "Forward" Policy, which has been well defined as demanding unwise precautions against imaginary dangers.

Its ostensible purpose is to protect India against foreign, and especially Russian, invasion, by securing the passes and planting fortified outposts in the inhospitable regions far beyond the Indian frontier.

INDIA'S NATURAL MOUNTAIN BARRIER.

But the fact is that India has a natural mountain barrier of enormous extent. Before the costly and futile "forward" policy was inaugurated by ambitious military officers, who found no opportunity of distinguishing themselves in times of peace, the frontier of British India, westward of the river Indus, was formed by a chain of mountains running southward from the Hindu Kush into Sind, and serving as a natural wall between the Punjab and Afghanistan.

The "forward" policy throws away the unique advantages of this natural line of defence, and not only goes to meet the enemy on equal terms, but also breaks down the strong barrier of brave and independent tribes which would otherwise protect India against Russia.

You remember that in 1858 the work of governing India was transferred from the East India Company to the Crown.

In 1864, Sir John Lawrence, whose whole life had been spent in the service of India, was appointed Viceroy.

It was during his Viceroyalty that the "forward" frontier policy was mooted, but Sir John Lawrence, as the historian says, "with a polite but plain-spoken negative brushed aside the rash proposals which emanated from Bombay and Sind."

For example, in a despatch to the Secretary of State, dated January 23rd, 1867, Sir John Lawrence, writing of "a proposal which has for its ultimate object the occupation of Quetta by a British force," said:

> "We"—that is, the Government of India—"are unanimously opposed to the project, and have conveyed our rejection of it to the Bombay Government in decided terms."

Similarly, under date January 17th, 1867, the Secretary to the Government of India (Foreign Department) wrote to the Secretary to the Government of Bombay:

> "His Excellency has deliberately decided in Council that an advance to Quetta is not desirable."

The Forward Policy "Unnecessary and Impolitic."

Again, in a despatch to the Secretary of State, dated February 23rd, 1867, Sir John Lawrence wrote:

> "The Political Superintendent on the Sind frontier was desirous to make Sirdar Mahomed Shureef Khan's presence at Quetta a pretext for our undertaking a military promenade in Beloochistan. We summarily disallowed so unnecessary and impolitic a project."

Finally, Sir John Lawrence, in a memorable Minute dated October 3rd, 1867, summed up his objections to the whole policy:

> "The paramount consideration in my mind has always been, and still is, a regard for the true interests of the State. I am convinced that we can gain nothing, but are pretty sure to lose a great deal in prestige, in honour, in the valuable lives of our officers and soldiers, by interfering actively in the affairs of Central Asia; and that, so far from strengthening our tenure of India, we may thus shake it to its very foundations. Nor am I insensible, I admit, to the financial aspect of the question. I know well what are the wants of India; how infinite are the material requirements of this country; how limited is the accumulation of capital; how obnoxious is every description of new taxation to all classes of the people. I am, therefore, most desirous not to throw away the public money on expeditions and wars, which may be honourably avoided, and in this view I decline to be led away to engage in a course of policy which too surely ends in such results;"

And again:

> "If we proceed to meet Russia in order to prevent her approach to India, we give her so much vantage ground; for we lessen the distance she has to march her armies while we increase the interval between our own troops and their true base of operations."

Lord Mayo, who became Viceroy in 1869, and Lord Northbrook, who became Viceroy in 1872, loyally maintained Sir John Lawrence's frontier policy—the approved and wisely conservative policy of the Government and the people of India.

Unfortunately, Lord Lytton, who became Viceroy in 1876, succumbed to the pressure which his predecessors had so wisely and firmly resisted.

Exit, Sir J. Lawrence: Enter, Lord Lytton.

It was in Lord Lytton's time that the rational frontier policy was first signally departed from.

In 1878 war was declared against Afghanistan.

Since that time the history of Indian "frontier policy"—or, to speak more accurately, "trans-frontier policy"—has been a history of wars, excursions, and alarms.

Between 1884 and 1886, for example, 2¼ millions were spent upon that occupation of Quetta which Sir John Lawrence and his Government had "summarily disallowed" as "unnecessary and impolitic."

Thirty Millions in Fifteen Years.

During the last fifteen years the policy of trans-frontier aggression has cost nearly thirty millions of money.

The invasion of Chitral, which, at the outset, was almost unanimously condemned by public opinion in India, is only the latest move in this ruinous and senseless game.

I ask you, Electors of Lancashire, what you think of this precious "policy."

Remember that the responsibility for governing India rests upon you as electors.

Remember that military "experts" are only too apt to favour military aggression.

Remember that the cotton duties were imposed because military extravagance has brought India to the verge of bankruptcy while taxation in India is admittedly at the highest possible point.

Will you not therefore induce your representatives to co-operate, if they do not co-operate already, with the Indian Parliamentary Committee in insisting upon a policy of peace, retrenchment, and reform in the administration of the affairs of our Indian fellow-subjects?

Yours sincerely,
An Englishman.

"Our local functionaries must not be trusted in India, any more than they are in Great Britain and Ireland, to guide Imperial affairs. Almost in direct proportion to the degree of their departmental dexterity, and the length of their Eastern residence, they are generally incapacitated for the higher branch of politics. A clear view of Imperial operations can only be obtained from the central watch-tower."—Major Evans Bell.

OPINIONS OF SOME EXPERTS.

I.—General Sir Neville Chamberlain.

General Sir Neville Chamberlain wrote to the *Times* of April 12th: The necessity for immediate advance and the route adopted have brought about the unprovoked invasion of the territory of independent neighbouring tribes, with whom we have no cause of quarrel and with whom we have in late years lived on fairly friendly terms. These tribesmen are too brave not to resist what they believe to be a first step towards the destruction of their independence; and this resistance—considering the immeasurable superiority of our arms and organisation—can only end in great loss of life to themselves and desolation to their families.

And after our power has been asserted what is to follow? If we withdraw from Chitral we leave an enemy behind who is sure to return to power, when our position will be far less favourable than it was before we interfered in their internal affairs. If we remain in Chitral, Bajaur, and Swat, the tribesmen will only be kept quiet by our retaining, at great annual cost, a sufficient force in the valleys to overawe them. Reduce or withdraw that force, and they will rise again; for their love of independence is not to be subdued, nor is peace to be preserved by us unless our sword is kept hanging over them. No British force or British agent can be in those valleys with the goodwill of the great mass of the people. Furthermore, the system of native rule is in English eyes so objectionable that our officers who may be stationed in such positions will always find cause for interference, to be assuredly followed by still further control, practically ending in annexation.

To make a military road through Swat and Bajaur and to expect to keep it open without coming into conflict with the tribesmen is, to my mind, devoid of reason. It must involve the eventual subjection of those tribes—unless the Government of India will, under every circumstance, abstain from all interference with the internal control of those valleys and will, further, bribe the chiefs and their clans with a sufficiency of rupees to satisfy their greed for money. To do this would be to place the Swatis and Bajauris somewhat in the same position as that now occupied by the Afridis of the Khaiber Pass, but with this weighty difference, that in the Khaiber protection has only to be afforded for caravans passing on fixed days through barren and uninhabited mountains, whilst in the other case a safe conduct would be needed at all times for troops and followers, often obliged to pass over cultivated lands and near to villages, and consequently brought into close contact with the people. It has also to be remembered that if the Khaiber be closed other routes are available for caravans, whereas the closing of the Swat road would again isolate the posts beyond the Peshawur border.

My opinions are not founded upon a hurried ride through a new country inhabited by a people entirely strange to me, but upon four years spent in Afghanistan and about nine years on the Trans-Indus frontier. During all this time I was in constant and intimate intercourse with every class of the people of the country. There is a Persian proverb, "The whelp of a wolf will be a wolf," and the truth of that saying will continue to be proved long after future generations have passed away.

Again, General Sir Neville Chamberlain wrote to the *Times* of April 23rd:—Probably no Indian statesman has ever been so deeply impressed as was John Lawrence with the urgent necessity of India being made to live within its income, and to this end his frontier policy was guided upon these simple axioms—to curtail all unavoidable military expenditure; to live in friendly relations with the *de facto* Amír and the people of Afghanistan; to maintain peaceable relations with the independent border tribes; and to avoid being drawn into any policy which should lead these tribes to turn to the Amír of Kabul rather than to the British Government. Indeed, it was his opinion that for many reasons it was preferable to have independent tribes for our neighbours rather than be brought into more extended contact with subjects of the Amír of Kabul. The success attendant upon this policy is a matter of history. It was only when it was departed from by the military occupation of Quetta and by injudicious interference in the affairs of Afghanistan that the seeds of distrust were sown in the mind of the Amír Shere Ali. He then became angered and distrustful, and began to doubt whether his independence might not be better secured by relying upon Russia rather than trust to the encroaching policy of the Government of India.

We are now assured that, because of the further advance of the Russian frontier southward, the Lawrence policy can no longer be efficacious, and that, could the voice of that able and far-sighted man reach us from the grave, it would be used to urge on the advance of the British outposts. I altogether discredit the assertion, and I go further and say that I believe his counsel would be, the nearer the approach of Russia the greater the necessity for acting in the manner most likely to secure to England the good will of the frontier tribesmen and of the people of Afghanistan.

As a matter of fact, it is now some years since the old policy has been discredited, and departed from, with the inevitable result that the military expenditure has increased by leaps and bounds. To extend the new order of things means to add continuously and in an increasing measure to the burden of the Indian taxpayer; and where is the money to come from, and what is the good to be gained? Is it reasonable to suppose that the Afghan nation will be made friendly by having an unpopular Amír forced upon them or maintained against their wishes upon the throne, or that our relations with the independent border tribes are "to be established on a firmer and a more friendly basis" by being deprived of the freedom which they and their forefathers for generations and generations have prized so highly? At any rate, that end is only to be acquired by conquest and by keeping them at all times under subjection by the domination of military posts.

My judgment leads me in an entirely opposite direction to that upheld by the progressists, and I think my view is supported by the circumstance of an insignificant border khan having now forced the Government of India to call into the field 15,000 soldiers in order to restore British prestige along the frontier and throughout India. What would have been our position in the Peshawur valley and all along the Upper Indus borders during the dark days of 1857 if the thousands of tribesmen who inhabit the neighbouring valleys had considered that they had a great wrong to redress? Would they have captured and sent back to us the mutinous sepoys who sought refuge in their mountains or have flocked into our service and helped us to regain the provinces that had been lost through the defection of the native army recruited in Hindustan? Nothing of the sort; they would have captured the hated posts, have killed their defenders, and have brought disaffection and ruin to the Punjab.

II.—GENERAL LORD CHELMSFORD.

General Lord Chelmsford wrote to the *Times* of April 12th:—Mr. George Curzon, in his very interesting and instructive letter regarding Chitral, which appeared in *The Times* of the 28th inst., spoke of it as being a position "of immense strategical value."

Now a strategical position to be of immense value should be naturally strong as regards its local surroundings; so that it may be held by a comparatively small force against superior numbers. It should have a plentiful food and water supply, and should be in safe and easy communication with the base from which it must draw its supplies and from which it can obtain reinforcements.

All that Mr. Curzon can say on the first point is "that it is not commanded by such fire as the enemy will probably be able to direct against it," which means that it is only capable of resisting a badly armed force which have no artillery. As regards food supply, the country round is notoriously deficient; and as regards water the garrison must go outside the fort to obtain it from the river which runs under its walls—clearly an unsatisfactory, arrangement if the fort is closely beseiged. With regard to the line of communications, Mr. George Curzon admits that they are most unsatisfactory, so that on all the three essential points required to make it a position "of immense strategical value" Chitral is found wanting. Mr. George Curzon advocates, however, as a *sine qua non* to the occupation of Chitral the opening out of the direct route now about to be traversed by the force under General Low's command. Has Mr. George Curzon realised that the effect of making a road fit for wheeled carriage from Peshawur to Chitral, would be to give an invading force a shorter route and better than now exists? Under present conditions a European force advancing from the Hindu Kush towards India, *via* Chitral, could not venture to use this direct route to Peshawur as it would be unable to carry a sufficieny of food supply, as I will now endeavour to show. A mule, which is the only description of carriage fit for such a route, will not be able to carry much more than 150lb. in a mountainous country where there are no made roads. Along the 180 miles between Chitral and Peshawur there are no supplies procurable from the country itself. Every day, therefore, a certain amount of forage sufficient to keep the mule in condition will have to be taken from its load, which may be estimated at from 8lb. to 10lb. In 18 days, therefore, a mule will have consumed its own load. Now, the rate of marching over such a country as that between Chitral and Peshawur would not exceed ten miles a day, including halts; so that, with no opposition, the force would require 18 days to cover the distance. But as the mule during those 18 days will have eaten up the whole of its load, it follows that there cannot be sufficient for both man and beast without one or the other being deprived of what is necessary for its sustenance.

I venture most positively to assert that Chitral is a strategical position of no value whatever either to an invading or to a defending force. Its occupation has been a mistake for which we are now paying dearly, and I sincerely trust that when the object for which the force under General Low is about to advance is successfully accomplished we shall retire from Chitral altogether and be satisfied with the occupation of Gilghit, which possesses every strategical qualification in which Chitral is so deficient.

III.—GENERAL SIR C. J. S. GOUGH.

General Sir C. J. S. Gough wrote to the *Times* of April 16th: The frontier policy of the Government of India has been for the last half century largely influenced by the Russian advance in Central Asia; that advance has been so extraordinary as to rivet attention, and, as they have overcome such difficulties and traversed such distances, it seems to many as if nothing was impossible to them; hence has arisen a constant "dread," it might be called, but that it is largely mixed with hope and absolutely without fear, of a Russian invasion of India. To many gallant eager soldiers it is a firm belief that the Cossack and the Bengal Cavalry sowar are to measure swords somewhere on the frontier, and it is their great hope that the long talked of war may come off in their time. I cannot but sympathise with their aspirations, but it seems to me that as a policy this state of mind is ruinous to India. In anticipation of this invasion every path and pass by which a goat can cross the barren, rocky, and mountainous region which separates Russian territory from India has acquired immense strategical importance. Several years ago Macgregor wrote: "If England does not occupy Sarakhs for defence, Russia will do so for offence." It is this spirit which animates our strategists, and which I venture to say is a false principle. Any officer who has had to select a defensive position for a post in such mountainous countries as Afghanistan has experienced the difficulty of obtaining one that is not "commanded" somewhere by another further on; in the vain hope of finding a perfectly satisfactory front, he would be led on and on until he found he had gone far beyond his tether, and it seems to me that this is our way with regard to our frontier policy; and the question for consideration is whether it is a practicable event, this Russian invasion.

Without going very deeply into the history of our frontier wars, we can see by what is going on before us at the present moment what would be the magnitude of the attempt at an invasion of India on the part of Russia. If it requires three brigades of four regiments each, with a corresponding force of cavalry and guns, to advance a short distance into those inhospitable regions, what would be the force that Russia would require to attempt so huge a task? Where is the base from which she could safely advance, and whence could she draw her supplies and obtain her transport, and by what lines could she advance, and what would be the cost of such an undertaking? We know from our own experience in Afghanistan what difficulty we had in keeping our army supplied, and that to draw upon a poor country for food was to risk causing a famine in the land. But when an advance of Russia is thought of, somehow all these difficulties disappear. She has hundreds of thousands of men (somewhere in Russia), supplies are produced, on paper, from barren lands, and transport arrangements easily provided; but, as a matter of fact, I venture to say, a Russian invasion of India is a phantasy, a veritable nightmare to our Indian statesmen, a vain hope to our ambitious warriors. Russia is not likely to venture on so huge a task; it is altogether, in my humble opinion, beyond her means and her power, and, happily for her also, I think, beyond her inclination.

I fear to trespass too much on your space, but a calculation of the amount of money the Government of India has spent under the effects of this nightmare would be startling, commencing with our advance into Afghanistan in 1839, and the war that followed, to present times. The real danger to India lies not beyond but within her border. Let us keep our army thoroughly efficient and loyal, and let us rule India with justice, consideration, and firmness, and Russia can do nothing to hurt us. She might add to our troubles if internal affairs went wrong.

IV.—General Sir J. Adye.

General Sir John Adye, G.C.B., wrote to the *Times* of March 29th:—Mr. Curzon first dwells on what he designates "the immense strategical value of Chitral," which he considers a "most important frontier State, the veritable key of the middle Hindu Kush." He then goes on to condemn, as he has done before, the policy of the late Lord Lawrence, which he considers to have been pusillanimous and one of culpable blindness (see letter in the *Times*, January 24th, 1895).

The policy of Lord Lawrence, which was also followed by Lords Mayo and Northbrook when successive Viceroys of India, was, as is well known, to avoid as far as possible interference with Afghanistan and with the affairs of our frontier neighbours, and to endeavour by conciliation and occasional subsidies to promote commerce and friendly feelings on both sides. It was, and, in my opinion, is, a sound policy, which should always be carefully adhered to.

When, in 1878-79, we departed from that system and entered on a course of violence and interference we at once found ourselves involved in a great war in Afghanistan, which cost this country about twenty millions sterling. It was bad in policy and unjust in principle from beginning to end, but happily since that period we have reverted to the wise and prudent course followed by the late Lord Lawrence and his successors, and with the best results.

With regard to the alleged immense strategical value of Chitral as the key of the middle Hindu Kush, I would point out that it is one of the long narrow valleys enclosed on each side by mountains about 14,000 feet high, which radiate south-westerly from the northern main range. It has no roads, and is of very limited fertility; and Mr. Curzon himself, writing a few months ago from that part of the world, said that, although there are passes over the Hindu Kush, the difficulties and utter scarcity of supplies are so great that invasion is impossible (see letter in the *Times*, December 18th, 1894). Again, he describes our North-Western frontier as being "probably the most difficult, and certainly the loftiest mountain region in the world."

It is apparent, therefore, that nature has accomplished for us all that we require, and that the strategical value of Chitral will best be maintained by leaving it alone.

The present condition of affairs is, of course, grave and difficult. As our representative in Chitral is at the present moment shut up with a small force in the fort, and surrounded by hostile tribes, it is imperative that we should march to his assistance and succour, and, as the circuitous route *via* Gilghit is impassable at this season, we are compelled to move a large force from Peshawur northwards for nearly 200 miles through a most difficult, little-known country inhabited by tribes who are warlike and hostile. It is important that the public should understand the grave nature of the situation. As no wheeled conveyance can move in such a country, it is evident that not only our field-guns, but all supplies of food munitions, and stores will have to be conveyed on pack animals. The advance, therefore, must be slow, and from my experience during a smaller but somewhat similar campaign in the adjacent country of Buner (upwards of 30 years ago) the difficulties and the cost must be very great. On that occasion we were opposed by some of the very tribes from Swat, Bajaur, and Dir whom we are now again about to meet. At the close of the campaign in question there were about 8,000 of our troops engaged, and our casualties in action were upwards of 800, although we only penetrated a few miles into the mountains.

Our object in the present instance will no doubt be accomplished, and there may happily be some want of combination of the tribes which would lessen the difficulties; but I hope that as soon as our representative has been rescued we shall at once withdraw our troops and resume the old policy of forbearance, conciliation, and subsidies, from which, by untoward circumstances, we are for the moment compelled to depart.

V.—"An Expert."

"An Expert," in the course of a letter to the *Times* of April 13th, wrote:—At present the Government only is in possession of the necessary information, and, with the facts before it, it has decided that interference between the blood-stained freebooters who are struggling for the possession of a few mud forts in these remote lands is necessary in the interests of the Empire, notwithstanding that interference involved, as the Government must have foreseen, the possibility of a costly and dangerous expedition such as that commanded by General Low. In order to justify this decision, the Government will be expected to prove that Chitral and the neighbouring States are, from a strategic point of view, vitally important; that they may be useful to us—which is difficult to believe—for offensive operations, and, if not, that it is wise to annihilate the defences which nature has furnished to us against the invader, by opening out and cultivating this barren country, by forming depôts of supplies in these wild tracts, and by constructing military roads in these pathless wastes. The Indian Government doubtless considered these facts, and it decided, in spite of the obvious objections, upon the policy which has been adopted. When we learn the reasons and motives which actuated the Government we shall be in a position to criticise and to condemn or approve. But we should not allow ourselves in our anxiety regarding Chitral to lose sight of the cause of the present troubles and to overlook the great and, indeed, momentous question involved—namely, the new frontier policy of the Indian Government. For a new policy has been recently adopted which may involve us in the most costly and tedious operations which we have undertaken since the suppression of the Mutiny. I allude, of course, to the policy which affects the belt of wild and warlike tribes south as well as north of Peshawur. Our former policy was ourselves to abstain from interference with their independence and to resent similar interference on the part of Afghanistan. This policy has been rendered very difficult of late years by the aggressive conduct of the Amír, who has claimed sovereignty over the tribes. More than once has his policy endangered our friendly relations with him. It was to remove this difficulty and danger that Lord Lansdowne despatched a mission under Sir Mortimer Durand to Kabul. The mission was quite successful, and Sir Mortimer Durand negotiated a treaty whereby the Amír renounced his pretensions and received in return a large increase of his subsidy. This was very satisfactory, and so far the proceedings of the Indian Government were not open, I consider, to hostile criticism. But the Government did not rest content; it determined on demarcating the new frontier. In the opinion of the tribes—and this must have been foreseen—demarcation meant annexation. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ.* There was resistance south of Peshawur, while north of Peshawur Umra Khan, an ambitious chief with a genius for war, a born leader of men, who found himself curbed and restrained by our Empire, took up arms in defence of his cherished independence and struck at the most vulnerable spot accessible to him—Chitral. Nor have the instincts of these wild tribes deceived them. The Indian Government may declaim and proclaim with the utmost sincerity, but annexation, in spite of themselves, must certainly follow demarcation. The frontier which is now being demarcated by pillars will be the frontier of British India, and the tribes included within that frontier must necessarily cease to be independent and must become British subjects. We shall be responsible for their orderly conduct, and how are we to discharge this responsibility except by coercing them into order by crushing them into obedience? Cantonments will be established among them—the sites, I believe, have been already selected—civil administration must follow our troops, with all its beneficial but unpopular concomitants, its education and schoolmasters, its law courts and attorneys, its sanitary regulations, its forest laws and its invariable satellite, the village money-lender. The result is inevitable. These warlike tribes will become peaceful cultivators, their swords will be beaten into plough-shares, they will learn the advantages of peace and comfort over fighting and hardships, and, like the Sikhs, will gradually lose their martial instincts. Truly a great triumph for civilisation; but how about the bill in blood and gold which must be paid? How about the recruiting field for our Army which it is the avowed object of the new policy to preserve?

Again, assuming that the policy is a wise and necessary policy, has an opportune moment been selected for its adoption? Could not the Government have waited till the finances of India were in a less critical condition? How is the money to be found except by loans in gold and consequently by increased taxation? Could we not have tided over present difficulties and maintained the *status quo* at least during the lifetime of the present Amír? Who knows what will happen when that great man ceases to govern Afghanistan—whether our policy may not then be recast and our frontier retraced?

I may here, perhaps, be allowed to allude to the suggestion which has been made that the Amír should be invited to co-operate by means of his army in the neighbourhood of Bajaur, with General Low. I cannot imagine a greater *reductio ad absurdum* of the new policy. We have paid the Amír to cease interference with certain tribes, and before the ink on the treaty is well dry we are to invite his interference and to pay him for interfering. For we cannot expect the Amír to give his assistance gratuitously. Reluctantly he renounced his authority over the tribes in question and left them to us to deal with. The Amír is a very astute and subtle diplomatist. Doubtless he foresaw the difficulties which we proposed to encounter with a light heart, and chuckled when we thrust our innocent hand into the hornets' nest. It would be childish to expect him to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for us unless he is well paid in money or territory. This crude idea may therefore be dismissed.

I have ventured to suggest certain points regarding which the Indian Government must give satisfactory explanation before their frontier policy can be approved, and, having done so, I for one am quite ready to keep my mind open, as free from bias as possible, so as to consider in a judicial spirit the reasons and arguments which we may expect to find in the official papers, which no doubt will soon be published—papers which, I trust, will include, not only the collective opinion of the Government of India (that is, of the majority), but of individual councillors in India and at home.

VI.—MAJOR H. G. RAVERTY.

Major H. G. Raverty, late of the Bombay Army, wrote to the *Times* of April 13th: I am not an alarmist, but I must say that this expedition is a serious one in more ways than one. If such a rage had not been shown of late years for seizing what does not and never did belong to us, because the people happened to be weak and very poorly armed, while we are strong, and provided with the most excellent weapons, including artillery, and all means of offence possible, the cause for such an expedition would never have arisen. While crying out against Russia's aggressions we, taking lessons out of Russia's books, almost outdo her. Had we not commenced to appropriate Chitral, under pretence that it belonged to Kashmir, who has no right whatever to it, and never had, and manifested a desire to seize more and to carry out in that part the forcible appropriation of territory which has been exercised all along the eastern part of the Afghan State, these troubles would not have come about. The revenues of India, in their present crippled condition, will have a serious hole made in them to pay the enormous cost of all this.

It is quite a new feature in politics, and in logic too, I fancy, that a large tract of territory belonging to others, who have given no offence, other than being weak, and desiring to keep to themselves and preserve their independence—a great offence certainly—should be seized upon and occupied, and if the people resent it, to carry fire and sword into their homes because travellers in their peregrinations cannot make short cuts through their territory without even asking their consent. How would such travellers like their neighbours, or strangers at home, in order to make a short cut, to despatch a strong party of navvies to force a road through their estates or dwellings, and occupy them?

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

Commenting on the expedition to Chitral, the *Spectator* said on March 30th, in an article by a well-known hand:—

It is evident from what General Roberts says that the intention is to keep the road to Chitral permanently open, and to assume a general control over all the tribes from Peshawur right up to the desolate prairies on the top of the Hindu Kush. He said in his speech of Monday: "Some may wonder why so much stress is laid upon the extension of British influence over tribes with whose religious and domestic arrangements we have no intention to interfere, and whose territories we have no desire to annex. The reason why it is desirable for us to try and gain an ascendancy for good over the border tribes (looking at the question merely from a selfish point of view) is that they are a great factor in the defence of the North-West frontier of India. They number over two hundred thousand fighting men, and our frontier is conterminous with theirs for some eleven hundred miles. Thanks to the enlightenment of the present ruler of Afghanistan, our relations with that country are becoming more satisfactory than they have ever as yet been. But it is *just as essential* that we should be on satisfactory terms with the warlike tribes who inhabit the mountainous districts between Afghanistan and India. It will not do to leave them to themselves until the time arrives when we shall need their assistance, or at all events, their neutrality. Before that time comes they should have learnt to look upon us as friends, and to appreciate the benefits which civilised intercourse with us will confer upon them. Moreover, it is all-important that we should be able to pass through their territories, and make roads to those points which we should have to occupy in the event of India being threatened by a foreign Power." General Roberts is not the sort of man to make speeches of that kind if he knew that his superiors would disown them, and his meaning clearly is that we are to govern the whole mountain territory between India and the highest points of the Hindu Kush, at least so far that we can cut and protect roads through it, and can call upon its tribes to remain quiet with a compelling voice. We are to be felt as the paramount Power through a country nearly as large as France, with Alpine mountain ranges all over it, and with no fertility, as Captain Younghusband showed in his most interesting lecture of Monday, except in scattered village cases where the fruit-trees grow. In that country are scores of tribes, all used to intestine war, all brave, and all children incapable of continuous policy, whose decisions and promises cannot be relied on for six months at a time. That seems to us a most serious undertaking, and one to which the nation should attend; but unless a disaster happens, the nation will not attend to it for ten minutes; will read columns upon columns about rubbishy intrigues for the Speakership, most of them misdescribed, and will not even see that we are about to stretch British dominion, or at least British right of control, right up to the Roof of the World, to the furthest point we can reach without trenching on Russian territory. There is something magnificent, we frankly acknowledge, in that British indifference and calm; but is there not something just a little stupid, too?

We are not, be it remembered, pleading that this policy be abandoned. We cannot compel ourselves to believe it wise; but for all we know it may be part of the strange destiny which in India for ever hurries us northward out of the revenue-yielding plains into the sterile and hostile region of the mountains where there is little for us to do but fight continually, and nothing at all to get, and we have no right, as we have repeatedly admitted, to put our own judgment, though it accords with Sir John Lawrence's, against that of a wilderness of experts who all say that the only defensible ultimate frontier for India is the Hindu Kush. But we do wish we could rouse the English people to a sense that we are overpassing our mighty wall, the Himalaya, and taking up the government or protectorate or suzerainty—call it what you like—of the whole half-desolate region between that and the Hindu Kush, that we must cross it with roads and telegraphs, that we must keep up and connect an infinity of fortified posts, and that we must be ready at any moment to subjugate it in the event of a rising or defend it in the event of an invasion.

Lord Roberts says the tribes will help us, for we shall make them friends, and in one way that is, we dare say, true. The tribesmen will swarm to our regiments as they did to the regiments of the Great Moguls, and very excellent soldiers they will make nearly as good as Sikhs or Goorkhas. But friends! Will Lord Roberts trust any Pathan alive if the invader offers more than we do, or if the Pathan fancies that his secession will restore India to its old Mussulman rule? Invasion, with all its incidents, the overturn of old chiefs, the fines, the blowing up of villages, may secure friendship a a century hence; but for the immediate future,—well, we suppose Pathans are human beings. Moreover, though we at least never forget that India is a military monarchy, and must accept the conditions of that position, the expense of this movement must not be left wholly out of calculation. The *Times* says we have already spent Rx. 128,000,000 beyond the frontier, and the *Times* leaves out the cost of military railways, the increase of the European Army, the expenditure on fortresses. We believe that besides the sum mentioned, the cost of the "forward policy" exceeds two millions a year, which, if we are to reign up to Chitral—and clearly if we are permanently to defend Chitral, we must in some sort reign over its approaches—will be increased sooner or later by another half-million. That is not an excessive sum to pay for the security of India, if, as Lord Roberts believes, we shall thereby attain the end, but we want Parliament to understand clearly that it is spent, that the fall in the price of silver is not the sole cause of the Indian financial difficulty, and that if we could but keep within our own garden-wall we should be rich; might cover India with railways, or if that were more expedient, might, in a generation, pay off the Indian gold debt. If we are driven forward, as so many Anglo-Indians believe, by some "manifest destiny" or other external and automatic force, so be it; but if we retain, as we fancy, the control of our own wills, we ought at least to know the facts, and not go plunging on with our eyes bandaged like those of a horse which is wanted to leap a flame. This expedition to Chitral is another step forwards in a very big invasion, and we ought to know more about it than we can learn from snippety little telegrams, chiefly occupied with the names of the officers who are to share in the chance of a great exploit.

The *Times* of Friday published a long letter from Lord Roberts arguing that we ought to keep Chitral, and assert what is practically sovereignty over all the Pathan tribes between India and the Hindu Kush. That will, he maintains, benefit those tribes, retain in our hands a strategical point of importance, and prevent the Pathans from joining the Russians when they invade India. General Neville Chamberlain, an officer of the first repute and much greater local experience than General Roberts, deprecates this policy, maintaining that the Pathan clansmen will be irritated by our invasion, and will, if we remain, only be kept quiet by a strong garrison, which will impair our resources both in men and money. The road from Peshawur, through Swat to Chitral, will of itself involve the ultimate subjection of all the tribes through whose territory it passes. The necessity of rescuing Dr. Robertson is admitted, but after that, General Chamberlain would, obviously, retire. In the present position of the British Army, it seems to us most unwise to increase the permanent demand on it, while the Treasury directly and heavily feels the annexation of those wild and disturbed hill countries. As to the possible hostility of Pathans, they will be more hostile as discontented subjects, and if not, they can add little to Russian strength. It is not fighting-men which Russia will ever want for any Asiatic enterprise.—*Spectator* (April 13).

As the Gilghit passes are blocked with snow, it will be impossible to deliver an effective attack on Umra Khan and his Chitral allies from that side, and it looks as if the Peshawur force will find itself involved in another "little war" of some magnitude. We should like to be surer than we are that it could not have been avoided.—*Manchester Guardian* (March 23).

We do confess that we view with a kind of despair the endless process of discovery by which one more pass, one more valley, is always found to be indispensable for the security of India. The Hindu Kush is enormous. As one sees its peaks and ridges and defiles lying on the map like the innumerable capricious creases of a crumpled newspaper on the floor one feels dismally that the insatiable desire of the militarists for a line of defence more immaculate than yesterday's, a desire that only grows by what it feeds on, is pushing us helplessly forward into a position which India may be unable to maintain without bankruptcy and unable to abandon without a loss of the prestige by which our Indian Government lives. The complete adoption of the forward policy must mean eventually the annexation of an immense extent of desert mountain, in which administration would be difficult and costly, and actual fighting frequent, which we should have to cover with roads, telegraph wires, and official and military posts, and from which no revenue would come. The Indian Empire already

> Staggering under the load,
> Atalantean, immense,
> Wellnigh not to be borne
> Of the too vast orb of her fate,

will be called upon to bear the whole of this new burden, and it is the duty of Englishmen to consider seriously which is the lesser evil for her of the two—the continuance of a possible increase of danger in the case of an invasion that is only possible, or the absolute certainty of a crushing addition to burdens which her financiers already scarcely know how to distribute so that they shall be tolerable.—*Manchester Guardian* (April 13).

Writing on April 23rd, the *Manchester Guardian* said: Now comes the real difficulty—that of deciding on the future of the country,—and with it the question whether the forward policy in Chitral has not been altogether a mistake. It is the old question of Sir Robert Peel—"Could not you leave it alone?" If we are to carry out throughout the border States which fringe the Indian Empire the policy which has been carried out in Chitral, we shall have our hands full. It is particularly important, if we may argue from the case of Chitral to the case of Afghanistan. The policy of the Indian Government has been to surround the frontier with a series of native "buffer" States, the most important of which is, of course, Afghanistan. It has been accepted as an axiom that the frontier must not run with that of another European State, but that these more or less independent Native States must be shoved in between. The principle on which our dealings with those buffer States should be conducted was laid down by successive Viceroys, but most clearly by Lord Lansdowne, as being one of non-interference in their internal affairs but absolute control over their foreign relations. The theory is a pretty one, but it will not work, as can easily be seen from the typical case of this very Chitral. By an opportune coincidence, the well-known officer who is on his way to the front as the correspondent of the *Times* publishes in yesterday's issue of that journal an article on "The Causes of the War," which is nothing less than a succinct and extremely instructive history of our dealings with that country during the last ten years. The writer is a "forward" policy man of the most uncompromising kind, so that we may be sure that he has laid no undue stress on the inherent difficulties of our position. Nevertheless the one fact which he brings out above all others, whether consciously or unconsciously we do not undertake to say, is that Lord Lansdowne's policy is not and has not been carried out. It breaks down on the question of the succession. Strictly speaking, the suzerain State, if the Lansdowne policy is to be carried out, should let the claimants, of whom there are always several in an Oriental country, fight it out among themselves until the best man wins. But practically it is always compelled, or thinks itself compelled, to intervene in favour of its own nominee, and consequently the non-intervention in the internal affairs of the buffer State is a farce and a delusion. We intervene precisely at the most important moments, when intervention is most felt, and when it implies the greatest responsibility. That is always the history of "buffer" States. Armenia in the ancient world was such a State between Rome and Parthia, and it was the history of Armenia. It has been the history of Chitral, and there is too much reason to fear that it will be the history of Afghanistan. When the present Amír dies the succession is pretty sure to be disputed. If the Indian Government acts on the principles on which it has acted in Chitral, it will intervene in favour of its nominee, and the end of it will be another Afghan campaign to be added to its dismal and unnecessary predecessors. The interference of the Indian Government with Chitral began in 1885, when Lord Dufferin initiated with regard to that country the policy laid down by Lord Lansdowne in the terms we have repeated. From that time to 1892 we had no difficulty, as there was a strong and friendly ruler on the throne in the person of Aman-ul-Mulk. The "buffer State" theory works beautifully so long as such a ruler can be had. But man is mortal, and in September, 1892, Aman-ul-Mulk died, leaving seventeen sons, each of whom thought himself entitled to the succession. One son, Afzul-ul-Mulk, having the luck to be in Chitral at the moment of his father's death, seized the throne and defeated his elder brother Nizam, who took refuge at Gilghit. Afzul then killed most of his remaining brethren, was recognised by the Indian Government, and it seemed that everything was well with him. Unfortunately he had not only brethren, but an affectionate uncle, who, in the person of Sher Afzul, suddenly emerged from his exile in Afghanistan, killed his nephew, and was acclaimed by the Chitralis as their heaven-sent king. The next move came from Nizam, who left Gilghit, where he had been under our protection, and drove out Sher Afzul. Nizam was promptly "recognised" by the Indian Government, and he took the next decisive step by asking for a British "Resident." The latter was sent, and appeared in Chitral in the January of 1893. For two years Chitral was quiet and the Indian Government was comfortable, and then, on the New Year's Day of 1895, Nizam was murdered by one of the few brothers who had been left alive. This boy of eighteen, however, was hardly equal to the opportunity, and the uncle, Sher Afzul, once more put in an appearance from Afghanistan. But meanwhile the plot was thickening considerably. Dr. Robertson had moved into Chitral fort, and had under him a total force of some 340 men. In other words, the "buffer" State theory had vanished, and the Indian Government was interfering directly in the internal affairs of Chitral. Simultaneously a new and important personage came on the scene in Umra Khan, a highly capable Pathan, who for some years past had been building up a little warlike State of his own to the south of Chitral. He saw his opportunity in the confusion consequent on Nizam's murder, and invaded Chitral at the beginning of this year. He took Drosh about the middle of February, was joined by Sher Afzul, and the two, agreeing that whatever happened the British must be turned out, marched on Chitral fort. The promptitude of the Indian Government and the admirable conduct of the troops have just saved Dr. Robertson and his force in time. But, so far as Chitral is concerned, the "buffer" State theory has absolutely collapsed, and it is more than probable that a British force will stay permanently in the country. We believe that to be a waste of resources and a mistake. There is absolutely no limit to this wild-goose chase after scientific frontiers at the bidding of military experts. Chitral itself is no very great matter, but it is of the greatest importance as a type and a model. It prefigures what the Indian Government will do, or at all events will be urged by all the strength of the military party into doing, in Afghanistan when the next disputed succession comes about in that country, and the principles which have been worked out in Chitral point directly to another invasion of Afghanistan.

General Chelmsford pours ridicule on the notion that Chitral possesses any military importance. It is lacking in food and water supply, while the line of communications with Peshawur would be difficult to maintain. General Neville Chamberlain, who has had many years' experience of this border country, condemns the policy of interference as strongly as Lord Roberts advocates it. He is certainly corroborated by history when he says that intervention almost invariably leads to annexation and a largely increased expenditure.—*Liverpool Mercury* (April 13).

Notwithstanding the high authority of General Roberts there is a disposition among some of those who have had considerable experience in India, and who indeed may be said to have been brought up in India, to doubt the prudence of the policy which has recently been adopted, and which is now being carried out. Even if these wild mountainous districts can be successfully invaded and the British flag placed on the highest point of the Hindu Kush, we shall certainly not be released from having to maintain a considerable military force far away from what may be called the centre of gravity of our Indian Empire. Then the Russian Government will certainly not like to see British soldiers or Indian troops under British officers in the immediate neighbourhood of the Pamirs. The British and Russian Governments are now indeed said to be on very good terms; but they cannot be expected always to remain so, and if one thing is more certain than another, it is that an aggressive Russian policy in Central Asia, and in immediate proximity to India, will not be abandoned.—*Northern Whig* (April 5th).

While it must needs be difficult for the ordinary layman to decide between the "forward" and the more conservative school of Indian politicians, we may at least expect the former to tell us whether they have sufficiently considered the financial side of the question, and whether, at a time when we have secured an agreement with Russia and the fear of Russian aggression is at its minimum, and when Afghanistan is friendly, there still remains a necessity strong enough to justify so heavy an addition to Indian responsibilities.—*North British Daily Mail* (April 15).

Printed by A. BONNER, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 6.] (NEW SERIES.)] JUNE, 1895. [SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus"	161
The Royal Commission on Expenditure	166
Lord Brassey and Others	167
"A Fighter Ever"	169
Anglo-Indians and the Congress	171
OUR LONDON LETTER	173
British Policy in India	175
Dinner to the President of the Congress	175
CORRESPONDENCE: The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure	176
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	176
NOTES ON THE INDIAN BUDGET, by A. J. Wilson	177
THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE, by H. N. Haridas	179
THE HOME CHARGES AND THE ROYAL COMMISSION, by T. Lloyd	180
Indian Trade and Trade in India. III	182
India and the National Reform Union	184
India and British Constituencies: Important Meeting in Manchester	185
Anglo-Indians and the Opium Commission	188
REVIEWS: Indian Scenes	190
"Chips," Linguistic and Literary	191

Indiana.

Is it not high time that the Parliamentary opponents of the "forward" frontier policy took steps to secure in the House of Commons a discussion of the Government's intentions in regard to Chitral? Such questions as have been put have been met with evasive answers—the Government, we are told, has not yet determined what policy it will pursue; or the matter is at present under its most earnest consideration. The danger is, as previous incidents of the same kind only too plainly show, that this sort of evasion may have the effect of postponing discussion until discussion becomes useless. One has only to piece together the scraps of news which come from Chitral in order to see how great this danger is. On May 9th, for example, it was reported from Simla that the Government of India was "in possession of the views of nearly every military and civil officer in the service of the State entitled to speak with authority upon the question of the future of Chitral."

> So far (the telegram continued) the majority of the experts are of opinion that the action of the Imperial authorities in the future should be confined to the keeping open of a good military road from the Swat frontier to Chitral. The others favour a British occupation, temporarily at any rate.

Then, on May 12th, it was announced from Kala Drosh that by the directions of General Stedman the various camps along the route from Dargai to Kala Drosh would forthwith move on to high ground. "This," the correspondent added, "is considered additional proof that we are to pass the summer, at any rate, in this country." At the same time the correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed from Simla that "the balance of opinion in India is undoubtedly in favour of opening up the new route." On May 14th a Reuter's telegram stated that the telegraph line had been carried to within twenty miles of Chitral. On May 16th the special correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed from Munda camp that all available labourers had been hired for the work of road-making. He added significantly:—

> When the main line to Chitral is thoroughly established and the forts stored and permanently garrisoned, it will probably become imperative to root out thoroughly all disaffected elements in Whandul and the adjacent territories by an armed force.

Finally, the correspondent of the *Times* at Chitral telegraphed on May 18th that "a site has been selected for a new fort in case the Government decides to hold Chitral."

I submit that this information furnishes ample ground for action in the House of Commons. If discussion is not brought on without further delay, the case will, it is reasonable to fear, be decided by default in favour of the "spreadeagle" school. It is surprising that Liberal newspapers in London have not taken up the subject with greater vigour, but nothing could be better than the leading articles in which the *Manchester Guardian* has deprecated the "forward" policy. The *Saturday Review* for May 18th contained a notable article from General Sir Neville Chamberlain in continuation of his letters to the *Times*. No one, he admits, can question the power of the Government to subdue the independent tribesmen, but, after this generous task had been performed, there would remain the necessity for maintaining their subjugation. The question is not whether it can be done, but whether it is expedient to do it. Sir Neville Chamberlain concludes with a practical suggestion:

> "It was in violation of military principles that Chitral was originally occupied by a small British garrison. It was six hundred miles from the British frontier, it was not accessible at all times of the year, and at the best of seasons was only to be reached by threading barren defiles devoid of supplies for man or beast. A new route of two hundred miles, again beyond the British border, is now, with all its prospective difficulties, a prescribed remedy for past faults; and if Chitral is to remain a British outpost, that line of communication becomes a necessity. However, as our statesmen have on two occasions thought it wise to withdraw our forces from Afghanistan is it not now possible—without loss of prestige—to make over Chitral and its inhabitants to the safe custody of the Amir of Cabul? That sovereign is already the custodian of hundreds of miles of the frontier which separates Afghanistan from Central Asia, and he can therefore be trusted in his own interests, as well as in those of England, to keep watch and ward over an additional Pass leading from the desolate region of the Pamirs."

One thing is certain. If the present Liberal Government lends its support to the costly, futile, and dangerous "forward" policy, it will pay a heavy penalty in the constituencies. It is now recognised in the United Kingdom, as it has never been before, that the fatuous policy of trans-frontier aggression and annexation lies at the root of the financial difficulties of India.

A military correspondent, whose authority on this subject is second to none, writes to me:—The original occupation of Chitral has led us in my opinion into a series of political blunders, and into what Mr. Gladstone once termed "blood-guiltiness." The independent tribesmen beyond the Peshawur borders are not our subjects. We have never claimed the right to rule them. They gave us no cause to chastise them, and we and they were at peace. We are the aggressors, and devoid of provocation. The Government occupies an entirely false and unjustifiable position in those valleys. The tribesmen must suffer, and the more bravely they defend their independence the greater will be their loss and their misery. The weak must and will go to the wall as far as the present is concerned. The loss of life on our side is lamentable; the loss on the other side tantamount to criminal. And with all these considerations beyond dispute, everybody admits the desirability of cultivating amicable relations with Afghanistan and the tribesmen beyond our borders. In a lecture delivered by Mr. Curzon that traveller has told us how hostile the tribes of Afghanistan are to the English nation because of the thousands of their countrymen and co-religionists killed by us during the two Afghan wars.

It is instructive to observe how wanton destruction of life in one place is employed to justify wanton destruction of life in another place. The eccentric *Pall Mall Gazette* of these latter days sent out a Special Commissioner to Turkey to enquire into or, at any rate, to write about the Armenian atrocities. His first article contained this passage:

> "Misdated and anonymous telegrams, telling of bare, ruined homes, where late the sweet Armenians sung, of slaughters of supererogation, of murder stalking and rape at large—and all this heaped horror just because the saintly Armenians worshipped Christ as we do—these terrible tales had come at last to make fifty Englishmen laugh loud at the lie of it all, and the other fifty fret and fever their poor little middle-class miseducated souls into a frenzy of fanaticism and self-righteousness. They forgot, these latter, that, up to the hour that is, we had won and governed India by the sword alone. They forgot that wherever we holy English thought it desirable for our own purposes, we had ever killed deliberately, extensively, and without doubt *most rightly*. They did not notice that deaths by bayonet-wounds were rife about Chitral, and that many Chitrali villages followed the all-fresh example of the Burmese, and so went up in fire."

Do Her Majesty's Government and the Government of India like the parallel?

It is impossible to over-estimate the importance of the meeting which was held at Manchester on May 1st to consider the Civil and Military Expenditure of the Government of India. The meeting was summoned by the National Reform Union, and the speakers included Mr. Philip Stanhope, M.P., Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P. The audience, it is true, was not very large, but it was representative and influential, and it listened with profound interest and attention to the advocates of Indian reform. Some of my Indian readers may not know that the National Reform Union is a political organisation devoted to the advocacy of Liberal policy throughout the United Kingdom. Its motto is "peace, retrenchment and reform." It has branches in many hundreds of constituencies and by means of lectures and leaflets it accomplishes an immense amount of political work of an educational kind. A member of the Union explains in an article that appears in another column the circumstances under which this important organisation has now incorporated the problems of Indian reform in its regular programme. The Manchester meeting was summoned on account of "the importance of this subject to Lancashire, emphasised as it has been by the recent imposition of import duties on cotton." But the activity of the National Reform Union is by no means confined to Lancashire. Through its influence, and its co-operation, for which thanks are specially due to Mr. A. G. Symonds, the Secretary of the Union, the problems of Indian reform promise to receive new attention at the hands of speakers and lecturers in all parts of the country.

The immediate value of the Manchester meeting consists chiefly in the fact that almost every person who was present was a delegate from a political association. In other words, almost every individual in an audience numbering some hundreds will since then have been the nucleus of many informal meetings elsewhere. The occasion was most opportune. Rarely have Indian questions held so prominent a place in the thoughts of the average British elector as they hold at present. The re-imposition of the import duties on cottons excited an interest which was strengthened and deepened by the signal object-lesson in trans-frontier aggression in Chitral, and which has since been reinforced by the Report of the Opium Commission and the appointment of a Royal Commission to enquire into Indian expenditure. We may hope that this newly aroused interest may not prove evanescent, and that British electors will be led to look beyond telegrams and despatches to the underlying errors of policy which are responsible for the disordered condition of Indian finance. Undoubtedly Indian questions will be to the fore at the next general election. Not only will every Liberal candidate in Lancashire be called upon, whether he wishes or not, to discuss the import duties, but in other constituencies also there is an increasing disposition to have regard to the claims of the Indian people. Mr. A. E. Fletcher, for example, the Liberal candidate for Greenock, and the late editor of the *Daily Chronicle*, has included in his election address a reference to Indian affairs, and he intends, I believe, to keep the Indian problem to the front throughout his campaign.

A report of the speeches delivered at Manchester will be found on another page. Their purpose was to insist, above all else, that the cause of financial embarrassment in India, and therefore of the re-imposition of the cotton duties, is to be found not, as some Anglo-Indian officials would have us believe, in the fall of the exchange-value of the rupee, but in spendthrift policy. That policy will have to be changed, and the power which can bring about the change is the power of the constituencies of the United Kingdom. The resolution, which was unanimously carried, put the matter in a nutshell :—

> "That this meeting, being convinced that the imposition of cotton duties in India is mainly due to excessive and increasing military expenditure beyond the frontier, urges Lancashire representatives in Parliament to strictly scrutinise this expenditure, and to press upon the Government the maintenance of a frontier policy which will secure the safety of the Indian Empire while economising the resources and giving contentment to the people of India."

Lancashire representatives will have excellent opportunities of giving effect to the spirit of this resolution when the question of the Government's future policy in regard to Chitral comes before the House of Commons, and when the Indian Budget comes up for discussion.

The *Pioneer* in its issue of April 2nd last, referring to an article which appeared in INDIA for the previous month, entitled "The War in Waziristan," charges its author with having dealt with the subject dishonestly on two specific points. It says:

> "INDIA begins by asserting that, at the Kabul Conference in 1893, a secret agreement was concluded with the Amír, under which the south-eastern boundary of his kingdom was to be marked. The truth, as everyone should know by this time, was that there was no secrecy at all in the agreement. Its terms were read in public durbar at Kabul, and were made known by the Government of India immediately afterwards."

We still maintain, however, that the agreement was secret, since only some of its provisions were mentioned in newspapers in India, and its text was kept, and is still being kept, strictly concealed from the public. Indeed the Government has persistently refused to state in Parliament even the heads of the agreement. In view of these facts, we may leave our readers to form their own judgment on the question of truth and honesty which has been raised by the *Pioneer*.

The other passage in our article to which the *Pioneer* took exception runs thus:

> "The tribal hostility in Waziristan being unabated, a British force entered the country in the last days of October, and was so severely attacked on the 3rd November at Wano that it was disabled from advancing further during the remainder of the year."

"This," says the *Pioneer*, "is garbled history with a vengeance;" and it proceeds to offer the following explanations in support of the charge:

> "So far from sending a punitive expedition into Waziristan in October, the Government of India attempted to solve the Mahsud question by peaceful means. Our Boundary Commissioner was, it is true, given an escort; but it was not of a strength which could justify more than simple defence of the camp, and its presence in Wano was merely to guard the officers who had to demarcate the border. . . . . To speak of the British force as being unable to advance further after the Wano affair would give the impression that the troops were engaged in a punitive expedition. On the contrary, they were forbidden to enter the Mahsud territory at all, and they obeyed their instructions."

Now these explanations are at variance with the following statement which the *Pioneer* published on the 12th September last, when the Government of India was preparing to invade Waziristan in order to coerce the tribes to submit to British authority:

> "Waziristan was declared last November by the Amír to be within the scope of British influence, and the frontier was marked. The line swept well west of the Waziri country, taking in Wano and trending away northwards. . . . . The British Demarcation Commissioner shall have an escort equal to repelling an attack in force. The Mahsuds must be coerced. With the Reserve brigade, 5,000 men will be more than enough to deal with the Waziris. Early in October our troops must move through the Gomal. There is something more than simple demarcation to be done in Waziristan. The Mahsuds have to be reduced to good order, and the task must be undertaken forthwith."

After this our readers will probably think with us that the term "garbled history" applies rather to the version of the affair given in the *Pioneer* of 2nd April, which not only varies from the *Pioneer's* previous statement, but actually contains two assertions that are irreconcilable with each other—namely, that the British force was sent to "guard the officers who had to demarcate the border" (an operation which necessitated their traversing the Mahsud territory) and that the troops in question "were forbidden to enter the Mahsud territory."

Special attention is invited to an article, published in the present issue of INDIA, in which Mr. A. J. Wilson discusses the Indian Budget. Mr. Wilson, who is a financier of experience and distinction, expresses the opinion that the system upon which the Government of India at present issues its accounts is "indefensible except on the ground that it enables the Executive to hide what it is doing." The external form is bad enough, but the internal arrangement of the accounts is worse. The result is that criticism is not only rendered difficult but is also liable to the official rejoinder that it is based upon a misinterpretation of the accounts. This is precisely what happened in the case of the Note which was drawn up by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress on the Indian Budget of last year. "What they [the British Committee] wished to prove," said Sir J. Westland last March, "was that expenditure had increased from other causes than exchange; what they actually did was to pick out the figures which are placed in the column of exchange in the Annual Statement of Accounts and, deducting them, to compare the others. . . . . The fall of the rupee, however, directly increases our expenditure under many other items." As a matter of fact, the British Committee avoided the pitfall to which Sir J. Westland refers; but what, in the name of common sense, is the use of setting apart a column for cost of exchange if its contents do not show the total cost of exchange? Sir J. Westland's rejoinder to the British Committee is, as will be pointed out in a second "Note" which will shortly be issued upon the Budget for the present year, "a severe if unintentional condemnation of the methods adopted by the Government of India in presenting their accounts." Indeed, Sir James Westland himself appears, on a previous occasion, to have committed the "gigantic blunder" which he charges to the British Committee. If Mr. Fowler, before he leaves the India Office, were to insist upon clearer and more manageable accounts, it would not be true to say that he had done nothing to promote Indian reform.

The Report of the Opium Commission was a foregone conclusion. It was not to be expected that such a Commission, supplied with such evidence, would arrive at any other verdict than that which is before us. At the same time it is inaccurate to say that Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., stands alone among his colleagues in the conclusions which he has published in his minority report. On the contrary, the two Indian members of the Commission, the Máhárája of Darbhanga and Mr. Haridas Viharidas agree with him in certain important particulars (for example, in regard to the total prohibition of opium-smoking), although they have signed the majority report. So far as public opinion in India is concerned, its hostility to the Commission may be said to have ended when the people of India were relieved of the unjust burden of the cost of the Commission. The circumstances under which the Commission was appointed appear to be overlooked by some of its critics. The "Anti-Opiumists," as they are called, are commonly represented as having moved for its appointment. They did nothing of the kind. On April 10th, 1891, a motion was proposed by Sir Joseph Pease, and carried in the House of Commons, to the effect that the system by which the Indian opium revenue was raised was morally indefensible. On June 3rd, 1893, Mr. Alfred Webb, following up that resolution, proposed that a Royal Commission should be appointed

> "to enquire both in India and in this country, and to report as to (i) what retrenchments and reforms can be effected in the military and civil expenditure of India; (ii) by what means Indian resources can be best developed; and (iii) what, if any, temporary assistance from the British Exchequer would be required in order to meet any deficit of revenue which would be occasioned by the suppression of the opium traffic."

Mr. Webb's resolution expressly recognised that the people of India ought not to be called upon to bear the cost involved in this change of policy. The Commission which he proposed would have been really useful, and would have anticipated the Commission which has just been appointed to enquire into Indian expenditure.

But Mr. Webb's resolution was not carried. What was carried, against the votes of the "anti-opiumists," was a resolution of Mr. Gladstone's, proposing the appointment of a Commission to report, *inter alia*, as to whether the growth of the poppy and the manufacture and sale of opium in British India should be prohibited except for medical purposes. Mr. Gladstone's cleverness was superlative, but it is not fair to attribute to the "anti-opiumists" something against which they protested in the division-lobby. Mr. Webb's proposal had the merit of considering the financial question by itself. In the enquiries of Mr. Gladstone's Commission financial and moral questions have been confused, somewhat to the disadvantage of the latter. Moreover, its enquires were limited to India where the effects of the traffic in opium have never been seriously attacked. It is in China, where the prevalent habit is opium-smoking, that the critics of the traffic find their chief ground for complaint.

The questions submitted to the Commission, and the answers of the two reports, may be briefly summarised as follows:—

(i) Whether opium should be prohibited except for medical purposes.

The majority reply No.

Mr. Wilson replies Yes.

(ii) Whether prohibition could be extended to the Native States.

The majority reply No.

Mr. Wilson also replies No, but urges that example and influence should be employed.

(iii) Whether the transit of opium from the Native States through British territory could be justly terminated.

The majority reply No.

Mr. Wilson replies, Yes when the British Indian traffic with China is terminated.

(iv) As to the effect of prohibition of opium on the finances of India.

The majority reply that the finances are not in a condition to bear charges for compensation, preventive measures, and loss of revenue.

Mr. Wilson says that there is no precedent for compensation to cultivators; that the information as to preventive measures was scanty; and that, generally, statements appeared to be greatly exaggerated. He remarks that the opium revenue has been declining and cannot be relied upon.

(v) Whether any change short of prohibition should be made in the present system.

The majority reply that the present regulations might be amended; that the "Bengal Monopoly" is the best system of production; and that Burma should be left alone for the present.

Mr. Wilson recommends that the sale should be restricted to official vendors with instructions to restrict the sale, and that smoking should be absolutely prohibited.

(vi) As to the consumption of opium and its effects on the people.

The majority report that there is no evidence of widespread moral or physical degradation through the use of opium; that it is widely used for medical and quasi-medical purposes, in some cases with benefit and for the most part without serious consequences; that it is not practicable to distinguish between medical and non-medical uses; and that the habitual use as a stimulant by young people is generally condemned.

Mr. Wilson observes that little evidence was tendered from the districts where least opium is consumed; that the habit is relatively exceptional in British India; and that the moral and physical effect is injurious.

(vii) As to the disposition of the people in regard to the use of opium.

The majority give no concise reply.

Mr. Wilson says:—"The people of India do not, so far as regards the greater part of that country, regard the use of opium for non-medical purposes favourably."

Elsewhere in this issue will be found Mr. Wilson's memorandum on the attitude of the authorities in India towards the Commission. Its contents should serve as a timely warning to the members of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure.

In the House of Commons on May 24th Sir Joseph Pease moved an important resolution on the subject of the opium traffic. He reminded the House of its resolution of June 1893, which urged the Government of India to "continue their policy of greatly diminishing the cultivation of the poppy and the production and sale of opium," and he invited honourable members to agree that "the system by which the Indian opium revenue is raised is morally indefensible," and to "urge upon the Indian Government that they should cease to grant licenses for the cultivation of the poppy and sale of opium in British India, except to supply the legitimate demand for medical purposes." Mr. John Ellis seconded the resolution, and it was also supported by Mr. H. J. Wilson. It was ultimately negatived by 117 votes, 59 members voting for it and 176 against it. The debate, which will be fully reported in the next number of INDIA, was chiefly remarkable for the truculence of Mr. Fowler. Those who heard his speech are agreed that he surpassed himself in the vehemence with which he denounced "anti-opiumist" members of his own party. Mr. Fowler, throughout his Parliamentary career, has been conspicuous for anxiety to be on good terms with his political opponents. The *Daily News* has written of him:—

> "Mr. Fowler likes pleasing people as much as Mr. Chamberlain likes annoying them; and that is saying a good deal. Of course this virtue, like others, has its corresponding vice or defect. There are occasions when a man ought not care what the enemy think of him; there are even some when he should be indifferent to the opinion of his friends. Mr. Fowler will never initiate a great policy or lead a forlorn hope."

If Mr. Fowler has not yet learned to suspect the almost frantic enthusiasm with which his speeches on Indian affairs are greeted on the Opposition benches, he ought to have received a warning from the ominous silence which he produces on the Liberal side of the House. He is too apt to treat his Liberal critics as if they were utterly devoid alike of the logical faculty and of moral sense. Opinions undoubtedly differ as to the expediency of the course which the "anti-opiumists" recommend, but the excellence of their intentions is above suspicion. Mr Fowler, however, gave them no credit for disinterestedness and he received, as usual, cordial eulogies from the Tory press.

Professor Murison in his speech at the dinner at which, on May 4th, Mr. Alfred Webb was entertained by his Indian friends residing in Great Britain, referred to "the extraordinary gratitude with which Indians receive the slightest attention." It is a pity that Anglo-Indians, as a class, are not more eager to win this easy and abundant return But the faith of Indians remains nevertheless unshaken. To hear the speeches on the interesting occasion which I have mentioned, and to mark their effect upon their Indian hearers, was to receive two commanding impressions—impressions, that is, of the abiding conviction among Indians that Englishmen will redress a wrong if it is really made known to them; and of the yearning of these cordial, courteous, intelligent men for "equality." The word was invariably applauded. The gratitude which they expressed for the benefits of British rule found its counterpart in a strong claim for more effective representation. They expect great things of the House of Commons. Let us hope that their expectations may not be disappointed. Meantime, as Mr. H. J. Wilson reminded his audience of young Indians, it is their duty to turn to the best account such local representative institutions as already exist. The ignorance of the average Englishman concerning Indian affairs was amusingly illustrated by Mr. Webb who was received, as he always is, with unbounded cordiality. It appears that when he returned to London from the sittings of the Indian National Congress he was asked how he understood the language. More than one Muhammadan speaker at the dinner exposed for the hundredth time the fatuity of those amateurs of the "Divide and Rule" policy who would fain believe, and persuade others, that the Congress consists solely of Hindus.

All who have had a share in producing the *Madras Review* are to be congratulated upon the excellence of its first number. It is edited by Mr. C. Sankaran Nair, member of the Madras Legislative Council and Fellow of Madras University. The first number, dated May, 1895, contains among other contributions a notable article by Mr. John Adam, who recently returned from London to Madras, on the Duties of Indian Citizens. There is, he thinks, plenty of talk and plenty of public agitation in India, but "these are very different affairs from the daily round of working citizenship, pursued without hope of profit or even, for the most part, of applause." To know and understand the history, the institutions, and the government of the country; to take greater and more continuous interest in the conduct of municipal and local affairs; to promote education and to support and improve the indigenous press—these are the activities which Mr. Adam regards as the paramount duties of citizenship. He will have done a good work for India if he succeeds in diffusing among its people something of that new zeal for the teaching and the learning of civic duty which men like Mr. Acland and Mr. Bryce have lately done so much to arouse in the United Kingdom. Mr. Adam's observations on Indian newspapers are candid and to the point. They are, he submits, too little like *newspapers* and too much like weekly philosophic reviews. Hence they tend to be merely supplementary to Anglo-Indian journals in the hands only of those who can buy many papers. Mr. Adam criticises "laxity of supervision on the part of many editors," and expresses surprise that none of the Indians who come to England thinks of training himself for the business of journalism. "It is business capacity, good reporting, attractive presentment of news, and accuracy in detail that are wanted." The *Madras Review* does not profess to be a newspaper, but it promises to be a valuable addition to the "indigenous press" of India.

FIDUS.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON EXPENDITURE.

IT has been said of an American University that the students direct the studies and the faculty directs the sports. It might, without great inaccuracy, be said of our present system of governing India that a clique of civil servants directs the policy while Parliament directs nothing. The terms of the reference to the Royal Commission which has at last been appointed come, not from the House of Commons, but from its servants. The Commission is to enquire into "the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure of India, "and into the apportionment of charge between "the Governments of the United Kingdom and of "India." Needless to say, it was not for any such limited enquiry as this that the Indian Parliamentary Committee asked before the debate on the Indian Budget last August. Mr. Samuel Smith and his friends, whom the people of India have to thank for the appointment of any Commission at all, asked for full and independent enquiry into the condition of the people of India, their ability to bear their present burdens, the possibilities of reduction in the expenditure, and the financial relations between India and the United Kingdom generally. In other words, the Parliamentary advocates of Indian reform requested a general "stocktaking" of the kind which was periodic under the rule of the East India Company, and, as we have shown in these columns, had the effect of conferring upon our Indian fellow-subjects some of the greatest boons that they have received. Mr. Fowler used to have the reputation of an acute financier. But since he went to the India Office he has apparently developed, or learned, the notion that it is not necessary to ascertain the amount of a people's revenues in order to decide what they may wisely spend. He offered, in his speech in reply to Mr. Samuel Smith's motion, to move for the appointment of a Select Committee on Indian Expenditure. The offer was unsatisfactory enough. But a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee must be approved by the House of Commons, and there was at any rate some ground for hoping that the terms of reference might be extended after further debate. That debate has, however, been avoided by the substitution, at the eleventh hour, of a Royal Commission for a Select Committee. The terms of the reference and the composition of the Commission have been determined without any possibility of intervention on the part of the House of Commons. Mr. Fowler must have forgotten his repeated statements to the effect that subsequent opportunities of discussion would arise. Recent events in Chitral have excited so much interest in the House of Commons that such a discussion would in all probability have led to some practical result. It would have been better for India, although it might have been more inconvenient to the India Office, if the terms of the reference to the Commission had been so extended as to include, for example, enquiry into "the present "condition of the Indian finances." As it is, the India Office has had its way. It has selected its own ground and, we must add, its own time. Amateurs of conundrums may ask, if it takes a Royal Commission nine months to be appointed, how long will it take to report? In order to avoid paralysis, it may be well to pursue the method of *interim* reporting on the several organic sections of the subject-matter.

Mr. Fowler has from the first held to the resolve that questions of policy shall be excluded from the deliberations of his Commission. But policy is a vague term. Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji have never contended that the fundamental principles of Imperial policy can fitly be submitted for revision at the hands of Royal Commissioners. What they have contended is that, between questions of high Imperial policy on one side and questions of mere book-keeping on the other, there is a large middle ground which Parliamentary enquiry might safely and usefully traverse. It was not the Queen's Proclamation nor the Act for the better government of India which ordered the recent invasion of Chitral by British Indian troops. Aggressive military operations in the inhospitable regions of the Hindu Kush are defended, by the handful of persons who believe in them, as a means to an end. The end in view is the defence of the North-West frontier. But this particular means may be, and undoubtedly the majority of competent judges believe it to be, not only useless but positively dangerous. Why should not a Royal Commission collect and examine the considerations which make for and against an individual theory approved only by a small clique of Anglo-Indian officials? What is true in this sense of military policy is to a great extent true also of other departments of Indian administration. Assuming the ends to be fixed and determined, we may nevertheless scrutinise jealously the cost and the value of the means adopted to gain those ends. Sooner or later, we may depend upon it, this task of investigation will have to be performed. Enquiry is wanted not so much into the way in which the Finance Department of the Government of India does its work, as into the way in which it is over-ridden by other Departments. It is common to speak of Anglo-Indian "authorities," or "officials," as a single whole. The term suggests a fallacy. All Anglo-Indians by no means approve the same methods or sets of methods. On the contrary—as in the case of the "forward" frontier policy, for example—a small but powerful section of officers at Simla is really baffling and disheartening saner colleagues who bear the burden and heat of the day. Experts like Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir David Barbour wash their hands of the precious schemes which have brought the Government of India to the verge of bankruptcy. It remains to see how much of the truth can be brought to light by that part of the Commission's enquiries which will have to do with the "management" of Indian expenditure. The authors of the terms of the reference evidently assume that "administration" and "management" are not one and the same thing. The combination of civil with military expenditure is perhaps rather misleading. If military expenditure in India needs to be reduced, civil expenditure needs to be increased. Among the many calamities for which the "forward" military school is responsible, few are greater than the postponement of urgently needed public works which its futile extravagance has brought about. Enquiry into the "apportion-"ment of charge" between India and the United Kingdom will probably prove the most fruitful work of the Commission. There is a plentiful sprinkling of War Office clerks among Lord Welby's colleagues, but even they will find it difficult to show that India is not at present grievously overcharged.

LORD BRASSEY AND OTHERS.

LORD BRASSEY is an observant traveller who knows the British Empire as perhaps no other man knows it. He is a man of business and a politician with ideals. He has spoken and written much during many years upon the broader issues of Imperial statesmanship and left upon the mind even of casual readers a general impression of wide information and sound judgment. A collection of his papers and addresses in book form promised to be a work of interest and value. The volume[1] before us is a disappointment. This is not the fault of Lord Brassey, unless it is a fault to be too good-natured. He has allowed two of the officers of the defunct Imperial Federation League to use his name as at once a cloak and an advertisement for a tedious obituary notice of that rather futile organisation. There are, of course, "papers and addresses" by Lord Brassey incorporated in the volume, but they occupy less than half the pages, and even this proportion is only obtained by inserting verbatim among the "addresses" many trivial little formal speeches and small letters to the press among the "papers." The more important contributions contain an amount of repetition which was inevitable in speeches mainly of a missionary character, delivered all upon the same subject before different audiences, but this is the fault of the editor, whose first duty to the author he was placing before the public was to select or condense his material. There are about five and twenty "papers and addresses" by Lord Brassey in this volume occupying about 160 pages. It is not too much to say that they might well have been cut down to one quarter of the number and to one half the space. No doubt this curtailment would have been made if the real purpose of the book had been that which is to be presumed from the title-page. Under those circumstances also the chronicles and the wisdom of Messrs. Loring and Beadon which, printed in the same type and inextricably confused with the work of Lord Brassey, occupy the remaining 160 pages, would have shrunk to a few explanatory footnotes, and a concise introduction. The book is not a monument to Lord Brassey but a monument to the Imperial Federation League, and in the construction of it Lord Brassey has been used as building material.

---

[1] Papers and Addresses by Lord Brassey, K.C.B., D.C.L. "Imperial Federation and Colonisation, from 1880 to 1894." Arranged and edited by A. H. Loring and R. J. Beadon, M.A. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

If one takes the book as it is and reads together the writings of Messrs. Loring and Beadon and Lord Brassey, it tells the story of the rise and fall of the Imperial Federation League and reveals with interesting clearness the causes of the failure of that organisation. After the manner of the proverbial fly on the wheel, the secretary and the editor of the League would apparently have us believe that the British Empire was falling headlong to disintegration and ruin until they took it by the hand. They indulge in some not uncommon misrepresentation of the "Manchester school," and take some credit for slaying the policy they attribute to it and teaching statesmen of all parties a wiser and a nobler ideal. Neither the "Manchester school" nor any other responsible section of public men ever held that "the best interests of the United Kingdom require that she should be rid of her colonies as quickly as possible" or "advocated an active policy of separation." It is true that earnest democratic statesmen, in despair at the misgovernment of the colonies, and of India, by Great Britain have feared that the "best interest" of those dependencies might require that they should "be rid" of the Imperial connexion. But that is very different from saying that it is the interest of Great Britain to be rid of them. The changes which this century has witnessed, the wringing of self-government for the colonies from the dominant class in the mother-country, in the face of discontent and veiled or open rebellion throughout the Empire, did much to remove that fear, and the closer union of all the parts of the Empire which the steamship, the railway and the electric telegraph have brought about, together with the changed attitude of the Imperial Government under the control of an enfranchised democracy, has driven the fear further and further into the background. The brighter prospect dawned a generation before the Imperial Federation League was born, and though a word of warning to Jingo statesmen as to the inherent rights of infant or ancient nations has had to be uttered and may have to be uttered again, the true note of all statesmanship has long been to "cultivate the sentiment of Imperial unity." The underlying problem of fifty years has not been between "Manchesterism" and "patriotism" but between "aristocracy" and "democracy," between the doctrine that the colonies and dependencies exist for the benefit of England and the doctrine that they have equal and inherent rights to enjoy freedom and to work out their own great future, in unity if possible, but if that is not possible, then in independence. As regards the colonies there is a great and dangerous fallacy in the common metaphor of "mother" country and "infant" colonies. After a time, in every-day life, between individuals, length of years ceases to confer unlimited precedence. That is still more true between nations. Many a father never adequately realises that his son is a man and not a boy. The aristocratic ideal of family life in England sacrifices the children to the parents and the younger branches to the elder throughout all generations. The "Manchester" man has another method. He takes his son into partnership on equal terms as soon as he is of age, and leaves his inheritance equitably apportioned between all his offspring. It is the despised "Manchester" system which is needed between nations of a common stock. It is partnership and equality which bind them all together. The "parent and child" attitude is distinctly mischievous, giving shallow politicians in this country a deflected appreciation of the problem of Imperial Unity. There were, we fear, too many gentlemen of this class trying to pull the strings of the Imperial Federation League.

It is almost needless to say that there is no fault to be found with Lord Brassey in this respect. His addresses in Great Britain and in the colonies are wisely conceived and wisely restrained. They are for the most part mines of statistical and general information, making the different peoples of the empire known to one another, inspiring each with a respect for the other, emphasising the bond of mutual interest, strengthening the ties of friendship and kinship, and always "cultivating the sentiment of unity." Lord Brassey was engaged in this work long before the Imperial Federation League was created. The earliest address in this volume was delivered five years before the League was formed. When that organisation had been started he joined it and became its treasurer, doubtless trusting that he would find through it congenial comradeship with men as well-informed as he was and with views as broad and sane as his own. The editors of this volume, half conciously and half unconsciously, reveal his failure.

They show him delicately restraining the aims of smaller men, but being constantly pushed forward. They show the gradual divergence between the greater and the smaller minds until at last the inevitable crisis arrived, Lord Brassey and others withdrew their support, and the League collapsed and disappeared. This is not the place in which to appraise the work of the League, to balance the good against the evil, and to say which prevailed. Readers of Messrs. Loring and Beadon's book, although it naturally presents the best possible case for the organisation of which these gentlemen were the able officers, will find much recorded that reveals the danger of attempting to transform a subtle sentiment into a material bond. The book should be read for the moral and the instruction which statesmen and politicians can derive from the ten years' failure of the Imperial Federation League, and the important essays by Lord Brassey may be studied by all who wish to forget the failures of the League and find the problems of a United Empire stated with a splendid sanity.

"A FIGHTER EVER."[1]

The publication of a second and enlarged edition of Mr. Bradlaugh's Speeches recalls some of the most representative scenes and episodes in a strenuous and stormy career. The details of that notable career have only recently been traced by loving hands in a full biography. These speeches, though dealing with some of the largest subjects into which Mr. Bradlaugh threw his energies, are but fragments of his thought and eloquence. He never spoke save with a practical purpose, we are told; and therefore he was never concerned to preserve permanent records of his speeches. Such reports, too, as have been preserved in newspapers appear to be rather incomplete or otherwise unsuitable for a collection like the present. "Most of his fully reported speeches at Northampton, for instance, though incomparably effective for their purpose, deal largely with temporary and personal issues; while most of his great speeches and lectures elsewhere on general questions were either briefly or not at all reported." If, however, the purpose is to illustrate Mr. Bradlaugh's oratory, the fact that speeches deal with issues that are temporary and personal ought not to exclude them. Much of the matter of the speeches in this volume may easily be regarded as temporary, and some of it as personal; yet it would have been a pity to have excluded any part of it. If even the big House of Commons speeches, here reproduced, "give but an imperfect idea of the extraordinary force and fire of his oratory, which was naturally at its highest pitch before large audiences," this must be because Mr. Bradlaugh shares the inevitable fate of all speakers, in being unable to get all the elements of their oratory transmitted to the printed page. It is an affectionate estimate to speak of "his hundreds of great orations," and there may be hundreds that hold Mr. Bradlaugh to have been "the greatest platform speaker of their generation." It is enough to admit the claim that "these collected speeches are not an unworthy memorial of a great speaker"—a memorial that errs on the side of modesty rather than of extravagance.

Mr. Bradlaugh's parliamentary struggle has gone into history. Four speeches delivered by him at the Bar of the House of Commons exhibit with lucidity and vigour the attitude he maintained throughout the contest, and the notes added by Mr. Robertson explain in sufficient fulness the circumstances and bearing of each speech. On every occasion, Mr. Bradlaugh spoke with a simple and earnest eloquence, and in a tone at once conciliatory and dignified. It is no longer necessary to trace the phases of the unhappy struggle. There can be no doubt that Mr. Bradlaugh acted as he did in perfect sincerity of conviction as to his duty to himself and to his constituents. At the same time, it was impossible that he should have obtained a fair hearing, for rancorous prejudice was rampant among his opponents, while some of them disgraced themselves and the House with their reckless misconceptions and gross ignorance of the simple facts of the case on which they were so zealous to adjudicate. The action of the Government itself was distinguished by its oppressiveness. While it gave no facilities to Mr. Hopwood for furthering his Bill to amend the law as to oaths, it pressed Mr. Bradlaugh in respect of the judgment for penalties for illegal voting, and it displayed no desire to curb the malignant offensiveness of the action of some of its supporters in the House. The opposition to Mr. Bradlaugh, and especially the spirit of that opposition as contrasted with his high-minded bearing, naturally prompted the stronger sympathy of fair-thinking men. His majorities at Northampton steadily rose under persecution. The working-men in particular stood by him staunchly. "I have been plunged," he said to the House in 1881, "in litigation fostered by men who had not the courage to put themselves forward. I, a penniless man, should have been ruined, if it had not been that the men in workshop, pit, and factory had enabled me to fight this battle." And, again, in the same speech, while disclaiming the aid of the Liberal party, he testified: "It is only by the help of the people, by the pence of toilers in mine and factory, that I am here to-day, after these five struggles right through thirteen years. I have won my way with them, for I have won their hearts, and now I come to you." At last, in January, 1885, on the assembling of the House, Mr. Speaker Peel, who had not been in office on the first challenge of Mr. Bradlaugh's right to swear, declared that he could not permit any interference with his taking of the oath. On August 9, 1888, Mr. Bradlaugh carried his own Bill legalising affirmation in all cases where an oath had been customary; but he did not live to affirm under it himself in the House of Commons. The vexatious technicalities of antiquated prejudice, when stubbornly challenged, must eventually be swept away by the common sense of the people.

As a member of Parliament, Mr. Bradlaugh gave his best thought and energies to every cause that seemed to him to make for the enlightenment and the elevation of the people. So far as religious matters were concerned, he imposed on himself, most wisely, a self-denying ordinance. "I am determined," he told the Congress of the National Secular Society in 1880, "that in the House of Commons I will never use my position there against religion." His parliamentary speeches on subjects more intimately affecting the welfare of the masses are by no means adequately represented in this volume. Here, indeed, we have a speech on Market Rights and Tolls (supplemented by Mr. Bradlaugh's evidence on this subject before the Royal Commission under the presidency of Lord Derby), a speech on the Compulsory Cultivation of Waste Lands, and a speech on Perpetual Pensions—all of them ringing democratically true. They make, however, but a very narrow representation; and the speeches on the Affirmation Bill and the Religious Prosecutions Abolition Bill must be taken as of course. There is no utterance, for instance, on the Truck Amendment Act of 1887, though, as Mr. Broadhurst told the Trade Union Congress, "every man, woman, and child who can read knows that the consolidating and amending Truck Bill was Mr. Bradlaugh's Bill." There is, however, an extra-parliamentary speech at Northampton on Capital and Labour, in which Mr. Bradlaugh addresses words of sense and truth to both sides, facing the difficulties of the situation with his accustomed frankness. "I say," he declares "that capital and labour may be reconciled by treating men fairly and reasonably on one side, and by the labourers knitting themselves together in the effort to try and treat others fairly and reasonably too." The difficulty lies in the perception of what is fair and reasonable, through the mists of selfish regard which envelope us so closely. Mr. Bradlaugh claims justice, and enforces self-reliance; and his position is none the less right that it became eventually a little unsatisfactory to some of his more eager working-class friends. A very able speech on Ireland, delivered in New York in 1873, is the fresh addition to the present issue. It is characteristically straightforward and energetic, and statesmanlike in its scope and tone.

---

[1] "Speeches by Charles Bradlaugh." Second and enlarged edition. Annotated by John M. Robertson. London: A. and H. Bradlaugh Bonner.

There are four speeches devoted to Indian subjects. Into these Mr. Bradlaugh carried his usual breadth of view, energy of combat, and sympathy with the weaker side's claim of justice. In 1883 he explained at Northampton "How we obtained India, how we have ruled it, and how it should be ruled," in broad general lines and in admirable tone. "I want to express my intense regret," he said, "that any question affecting Indian rule should be made a matter of party cry and party politics." Again: "If there are to be competitive examinations for the Civil Service, and I think it wise and right that there should be, then the candidates should be examined in Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras." Once more: "We want to put before the people of India a future in which, if they will be patient, as they have been, they may climb, slowly it may be, but surely, to the fullest right of self-government, in course of time. . . . . They may have to climb slowly and painfully, but that will give them the opportunity of making their way upward all the more surely." Here also is Mr. Bradlaugh's address to the Indian National Congress at Bombay in 1889—wise words of appreciation, encouragement, and exhortation. "The lesson I read here," he said, in reference to the sneering allegation that there is no Indian nation and therefore no National Congress, "the lesson I read here is, that this Congress movement is an educational movement acting as a hammer upon the anvil of millions of human brains, until it welds into one common whole men in whom the consciousness of the need for political and social reforms, and the desire to effect such reforms, are higher than all distinctions of race and creed." Again: "In this movement let there be no force save the force of brain, no secret union—let all be open, frank, and before the law." And again the sober caution: "Do not expect too much, and do not expect it all at once. . . . . Do not be disappointed if of the largest claims only something is conceded. If not just now, it shall be on a day that is to come." Regarding the other two speeches—on the Famine Insurance Fund and on the case of the Máháràja of Kashmir—Mr. Robertson tells us they "were so effective even under the chilling circumstances of an Indian debate in the House of Commons that each in the end carried its point, the Insurance Fund being ultimately restored and the Máháràja finally reinstated." The friends of reasonable reforms in India will regard these Indian speeches with kindly interest and gratitude as memorials of a sincere and active friendliness.

The final group consists of ten closing addresses at Congresses of the National Secular Society in various large towns of England and Scotland in the years 1879-1888. The retrospects and prospects are full of fight and iconoclasm, thoroughly characteristic of the speaker. At the same time the womanly tenderness of the veteran campaigner is frequently unveiled, especially where he feels bound to acknowledge a personal kindness, or even just consideration. Thus, from time to time, glimpses of his life of struggle are opened up suddenly and interestingly. Apart from the truculence of religious warfare, there is much sound doctrine in these addresses, and it is judiciously and firmly enforced. Thus: "We affirm that in no country ought thought on matters of religion to be hindered by penal laws. We declare that in every country religious disabilities should be swept away." Again: "Humanity is growing larger than castles, larger than temples, larger than empires, larger than creeds, larger than churches; men once built these, now they are outgrowing them. I have faith in that Humanity." Faithful to conviction, Mr. Bradlaugh acted up to his motto, "Thorough." He smote his enemy with all his might. "We are a fighting party," he said in 1883; "we are fighting for our existence; our platform is not yet free." He was perfectly, even keenly, aware of the hardness of his blows. "I have said many a bitter word and many a harsh thing," he said in that same speech of 1883; "perhaps some had been better not said." The fierce carriage seems to be against the natural grain. "Yet," he continues, "were I to live my life again, with the knowledge of how cruel, how merciless the Church has been, how it has made speech impossible, how it has poisoned our lives, I might wonder that all my language had not been bitter instead of only some." For a just judgment of Mr. Bradlaugh's action it is necessary to get to the right standpoint of his experience of life and his reading of history. In any case, he was a man of just, earnest, and fearless character, more staunch for principle than careful of worldly position or life itself. And in view of the essential elements of his personality, large allowance will be made for his incompleteness of thought and his mistakes in action, when he comes to be summed up at the tribunal of history.

ANGLO-INDIANS AND THE CONGRESS.

(From a Gorakhpur Correspondent.)

The Indian National Congress has now been ten years in existence, but it may be doubted whether the bulk of Anglo-Indians have formed anything like a fair estimate of the origin, the consitution, and the aims of the movement. They hold, naturally enough, that they govern India well. Moreover, that there is a possibility of any defect having crept into their system of administration, it would be heresy on their part to admit or avow. They seem to be mentally incapacitated from grasping the fact that any improvement is possible, or that a movement which has for its object the suggestion of certain reforms can deserve anything but censure. Their censure resolves itself into three main charges: (i) That the Indian National Congress is a Babu Congress; (ii) that it is composed partly of disappointed and impecunious pleaders, and partly of youths who, having received an English education, are cast adrift upon the world; and (iii) that its proposals are utterly impracticable.

(i) We are told that it is a Babu Congress. Many Anglo-Indians who make this allegation intend merely to show their contempt for the Congress, just as the *Civil and Military Gazette* the other day, referring to a speech delivered by the Hon. Pherozshah Mehta in the Imperial Legislative Council, spoke of him as "Babu Pherozshah Mehta." This sarcasm had not the desired effect upon the distinguished Parsi barrister. In reply he said that he was proud to be called a Babu. Many Anglo-Indians, on the other hand, without intending to imply any discredit, are honestly of the opinion that the Congress is mainly composed of Bengalis, whose sole object is, they say, to indulge in frothy talk. Now, if there were any truth in the allegation that the delegates attending the Congress are chiefly drawn from the Bengali race, the claim of the Congress to be considered a national assembly would certainly have to be surrendered. But the allegation is untrue. The Congress publishes every year an official report of its proceedings, giving, in an appendix, a list of delegates, with reference to whom the following particulars are shown in tabular form: Number; Presidency or Government; Congress circle; Electoral division; Names in full of delegates with honorary titles, scholastic degrees, etc., etc.; Race, religion, denomination, and caste (if any); Occupation and addresses; How and when elected. Indeed, it is stated, on high authority, that the Government so far interests itself in the Congress as to obtain full information about the delegates who attend it. Be this as it may, the last report shows that at the recent Congress, held in Madras, only a comparatively small percentage of the delegates were of the Bengali race. It may be said that this small number is to be accounted for by the fact that the particular Congress was held so far from Bengal. I have, therefore, collected the statistics for the last six years, when the meetings of the National Congress were held in the six most important Provinces of India—viz., Bombay, Bengal, the Central Provinces, the North-West Provinces, the Punjab, and Madras.

Year.	Province.	Total number of Delegates.	Bengalis.	Madrasis.	Per cent. of Bengalis.	Per cent. of Madrasis.
1889	Bombay	1889	162	372	8·5	19·6
1890	Bengal	677	312	55	46·1	8·1
1891	Central Provinces	812	68	78	8·3	9·6
1892	North-West Provinces	625	121	44	19·3	7
1893	Punjab	867	83	33	9·5	3·9
1894	Madras	1163	33	933	2·8	80
	Total	6033	779	1515	13	25

This statement shows that, for the six years ending 1894, the average number of Bengalis present was 13, and of Madrasis 25 per cent. In connexion with this result one ought also to bear in mind that the different centres at which the Congress has held its meetings have been nearer and more accessible to Bengal than to Madras. A larger number of Bengalis, therefore, might well have attended, especially as the population of Bengal is far in excess of that of Madras.

(ii) We are told that the Congress is composed of briefless pleaders and English-educated youths of no occupation. It is a pity that our critics do not attend the Congress while it is in session. They would then find that the majority of the delegates are men of middle age. As to their occupations, the Congress Report furnishes the particulars. Undoubtedly a large number of representatives are drawn from the Bar, as is the case with public bodies the world over. But the greater number of these barristers are men of mature age, while many of them are the leaders of the Bar in their respective localities. It is impossible to give anything like a complete list of eminent members of the Bar who are supporters of the Congress, but I have picked out from each Province the names of a few men who have achieved distinction in their profession, who occupy a prominent position as members of the Imperial or Local Councils, or whose worth has been recognised by the Government itself by the bestowal upon them of high judicial appointments or titles of honour:

From Madras: Hon. P. Anandu Charlu; Hon. Sankara Nair; Hon. R. Rangiah Naidu; Hon. R. Kalayana Sunder

Iyer; Hon. N. Pantulu Guru; Hon. Bashyam Iyengar; Hon. S. Subramaniyam Iyer (Judge, High Court); Rai Bahadur Swanunda Iyer (Government Pleader, Tanjore); Rai Bahadur S. Lengaya Pantulu.
FROM BENGAL: Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter; Hon. W. C. Bonnerji; Hon. L. M. Ghose; Hon. Rash Bihari Ghose; Hon. Mohini Mohan Roy; Hon. A. M. Bose.
FROM BOMBAY: Hon. Pherozshah Mehta; Hon. V. R. Natu; Hon. C. H. Seetalvad; Rao Bahadur P. L. Magpurkur; Rao Sahib Shirluhkar; Rao Sahib S. B. Bhate; Rao Bahadur G. R. Yarud; Rao Sahib J. R. Nunkar.
FROM NORTH-WEST. PROVINCES: Hon. Ramkali Chowdhry; Hon. Sree Ram; Hon. Charu Chunder Mutter.

I have given only the names of those who have received some official recognition from Government, but I need hardly say that there are other members of the Congress who are equally distinguished in their profession. Of such men any assembly might well be proud, and it would be the height of absurdity to call them briefless and impecunious members of the Bar.

But what of the delegates who do not belong to the legal profession? Are they really immature youths, who have no ostensible occupation? Again, the Congress Reports tell a different tale. We find the zemindars, merchants, bankers, doctors, journalists, teachers in private institutions, tradesmen, clerks, Indian Government officials, and even priests of different religions fully and freely represented. The last Congress Report, for example, shows that amongst the delegates there were present: Zemindars or landholders, 275; merchants, bankers, and contractors, 167; tutors and teachers, 68; editors and managers of journals, 34; members of the medical profession, 11; and many others who were either retired Government servants, municipal commissioners, priests, clerks, or tradesmen.

(iii) The third charge brought against the Congress is that its proposals are utterly impracticable. It is, however, a significant fact that the Government itself has sometimes been gracious enough to adopt the proposals of the Congress. The Congress from the first agitated for the expansion of the Legislative Councils. The Government for a time turned a deaf ear to the prayers of the people and declared that it was impossible to grant the boon which was asked for. At the instance of the Congress, Mr. Bradlaugh introduced a Bill in the House of Commons dealing with the reform of the Councils. Suddenly what was once impracticable came to be regarded as falling within the range of practical politics, and the expansion of the Councils on an elective basis, and the right of interpellation, were granted.

The necessity for the separation of judicial and executive functions exercised by magistrates is a matter discussed by every Congress. At last the evil resulting from combination of these functions has been recognised by two Secretaries of State for India, Lord Kimberley and Lord Cross, and it has been shown by competent authorities in India that the new scheme could be introduced without much extra cost to the Government. This is a reform which is eminently practicable, and it would undoubtedly have been taken up by the Government of India if its attention were less completely absorbed in schemes of trans-frontier aggression.

The abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State for India is another demand made by the Congress. That this august body has run its course of usefulness is now dawning upon our rulers, who are gradually reducing the number of members composing it. Before long we may see its extinction an accomplished fact.

Since the Congress came into existence it has been praying for the reduction of the Home Charges. Until recently not many Anglo-Indians considered that this was a practical question. Now, however, the shoe is pinching, and we find distinguished ex-officials moving resolutions in the House of Commons having for their object the reduction of these charges, and Lancashire merchants join hands with them, having suddenly realised the fact that these charges are excessive and unjust to India. This is precisely what the Congress has been doing its best to impress upon the public for years past.

Take again the enormous increase of the military expenditure in India which the Congress has, with such persistence, made the subject of special attack. For daring to interfere with this question it has excited a good deal of odium among Anglo-Indians. But what do we find now? There is a split in the Anglo-Indian camp. In the Imperial Council itself, a member nominated by Government, Sir Griffith Evans, recently recorded a strong protest against the unnecessary increase in the military expenditure in India and called into question the necessity of India's being involved in so many frontier wars. Sir A. Colvin and Sir D. Barbour, not to mention others, have borne similar testimony.

Some of the other demands of the Congress, it must be admitted, do not meet with the approval of Anglo-Indians. But we have the consoling assurance that eminent and competent authorities in and out of the House of Commons are prepared to recognise the reasonableness and justice of our claims. True, the Government of India is opposed to the holding, in England and in India, of simultaneous examinations for the public services, but a vote of the House of Commons has declared that this measure of justice should be conceded to India. We cannot, therefore, be blamed if we refuse to accept the Anglo-Indian verdict that this question is outside the range of practical politics. Similarly in respect to other reforms which are proposed by the Congress—such as the introduction of a permanent settlement and the reduction of the duty on salt—we feel sure that sooner or later the justice of our demands will be recognised and our prayers granted.

Finally, I trust that Anglo-Indians will no longer ignore the fact that the Indian National Congress is a natural and spontaneous movement, on the part not of one race or one community, but of all races and all communities in India to agitate in a strictly lawful and temperate manner for the introduction of certain reforms in the administration, and that as such it is entitled to their sympathy and support, instead of the ridicule and the hostility which it meets with at the hands of some of them. As an Indian Christian I feel strongly that the lives and the interests of the members of my community are dependent upon the permanence of British rule in India, and I feel as strongly that we should be wanting in the duty which we owe to our country if we were to fail to support a movement the sole object of which is undoubtedly to advance the national interests.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has approved of the appointment of Lord Welby as Chairman of the Royal Commission to enquire into the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure of India, and into the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India; and of the following as members of the Commission: The Right Hon. Leonard Courtney, M.P., the Right Hon. W. L. Jackson, M.P., the Hon. G. N. Curzon, M.P., Field-Marshal Sir Donald Stewart, Sir William Wedderburn, M.P., Sir E. W. Hamilton, Sir James Peile, Sir Andrew Scoble, M.P., Mr. T. R. Buchanan, M.P., Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., Mr. R. H. Knox, and Mr. G. L. Ryder; also of Mr. Richmond Ritchie, as Secretary to the Commission.

The following important motion in the name of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., still appears in the Order Book of the House of Commons: That in the opinion of this House, in order to preserve and maintain the stability of the British power, the loyalty, confidence, contentment, and gratitude of the people of British India, to improve their material and moral condition, and to increase largely commercial and industrial benefits to the people of the United Kingdom, it is expedient that the solemn pledges of the Act of 1833, of the Proclamation of 1858 after the Mutiny, of the Proclamation of 1877 on the assumption of the Imperial title at the great Delhi Durbar, and of the further confirmation of these Proclamations on the Jubilee of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen and Empress of India, should be fulfilled by, among other reforms, giving effect to the Resolution adopted by this House on 3rd June, 1893, viz.: That all open competitive examinations heretofore held in England alone for appointments to the Civil Services of India shall henceforth be held simultaneously both in India and England, such examinations in both countries being identical in their nature, and all who compete being finally classified in one list according to merit.

The Shahzada Nasrulla Khan, whose arrival in England was one of the "events" of last month, passed a somewhat exhausting day on the morrow of his arrival. It had been intended originally that he should join the Duke of Cambridge at Gloucester House and proceed to the Queen's Birthday ceremonial on the Horse Guards Parade with the Commander-in-Chief, but, quite late, the programme was altered and his Highness, at the request of the Prince of Wales, went direct to Marlborough House, where he joined the royal procession, having been provided with a horse from the Prince of Wales's stables. The Shahzada took his part as a distinguished spectator, resplendent in scarlet and gold with epaulettes of heavy gold lace. The sight was calculated to impress an Afghan prince.

From the parade ground the Shahzada went to Dorchester House and, almost from the moment of his return to his temporary home, a round of ceremonial visits began. First, at 1 o'clock, came the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York, then came the Duke of Connaught, who was due at the Military Tournament later, and the Duke of Saxe-Coburg. Next his Highness proceeded to Marlborough House to return the visit of the Prince of Wales in all state, and from Marlborough House he proceeded to Clarence House to return the call of the Duke of Saxe-Coburg. Next came a call by the Duke of Cambridge, which was also returned.

These proceedings in themselves made a long day for a Prince who had come, only the day before, to the end of a long voyage. But in the evening he attended the State dinner at the India Office, where he met many persons connected directly and indirectly with the Indian Empire. Add to this a reception at Brook House, and it becomes clear that His Highness spent a fatiguing day. On the following day, Sunday, it had been intended that the Shahzada should visit the Zoological Gardens in the course of the afternoon, but he felt weary after the exertions of the preceding day, and the clusters of spectators who gathered outside Dorchester House from time to time reaped no reward. In fact, our visitor never moved out of doors at all. It was arranged that the Shahzada should visit the Queen at Windsor on Monday, May 27th.

The Amír's son is evidently imbued with the idea that time was made for princes. On the Saturday night after his arrival he kept the distinguished guests of the Secretary of State for India waiting forty minutes for dinner. At lady Tweedmouth's party afterwards he was nearly half an hour late. The Prince of Wales, the Princess Louise, the Duke of York, and other members of the Royal family awaited his arrival on the first landing of the staircase, looked down upon by the brilliant company thronging a staircase which reproduced in miniature the famous scene at the Foreign Office on other birthday nights.

Is it intended to make the Shahzada an honorary general in the British army? One asks because a British general's sword, with corresponding belt and sash, prepared in a great hurry by the famous sword-makers in Pall Mall, was presented to him, on behalf of the Government, before he landed at Portsmouth, and he wore these accoutrements at the Trooping of the Colour.

The following passage occurred in the speech which Lord Rosebery delivered at the National Liberal Club on May 8th:—"But, surely, we may say at least that, when the front Opposition bench in the House of Commons compare the fortunes of warfare with the front Government bench in the House of Commons, they must come to the conclusion that, during the present Session, to put it mildly, they have had very much the worst of it. (Cheers.) I think we must all remember the speech of Mr. Asquith on the Address in reply to Mr. Chamberlain. That was what we call a pulverizing speech. Then we must remember the speech of Mr. Fowler—

(cheers)—on the great—what am I to call it? I was going to call it "intrigue," but I will not use so base a word—I will call it the great transaction ending in a remarkable manœuvre—(laughter)—which dealt with the Indian cotton duties. Was there ever a speech more absolutely convincing delivered to the House of Commons than that of Mr. Fowler, or one which drove his opponents to more extreme straits?"

From the military point of view (the *Manchester Guardian* writes) India is, on her north-west frontier, like a town guarded against possible attack by a moat. One body of experts holds that the town is best defended by the depth and width of the moat. Another holds that the moat cannot be trusted, and that it would be better partly to fill it up or make it shallower, so that the inhabitants could wade out anywhere and meet the enemy in the middle of it, or perhaps on the other side. In the case of India the moat which this second body of experts propose to make fordable is a great band of mountainous desert. They wish to make it less impassable to themselves, and they are not afraid of making it less impassable to a possible enemy. But, in the case of the moated town, if its rulers found the experts remarkably divided on the question of filling up the moat or letting it be, and if they did not feel themselves equal to a decision on the professional disagreements of doctors, they might still be quite competent to count the cost of the two schemes of defence, and if they found that the expense of filling up the moat threatened the town with bankruptcy they would be justified in deciding to face a very doubtful and distant danger of military disadvantage rather than the immediate and very grave danger of financial disaster.

This (the *Manchester Guardian* continues) is the point which the English public has to decide. It may not be competent to decide between the precise values of "scientific" frontiers. But it is quite capable of taking roughly the opinions of the most competent men, and of ascertaining that, as we believe to be the case, there is no overwhelming balance of expert opinion in favour of either the "forward" or the Lawrence policy. This done, it is quite capable of counting the cost of the two policies. And if it finds that the one policy is ruinously expensive to India, while the other policy is comparatively cheap, then the conclusion is obvious. Whichever course is adopted will be called suicidal by many respectable military experts. But we would rather see a solvent India threatened with military danger by Lord Roberts and Captain Younghusband than a bankrupt India threatened with the same danger by Sir Neville Chamberlain and Sir John Adye.

Proposing the toast of "The Navy, the Army, and the Reserve Forces," at the annual festival of the Printers' Pension, Almshouse, and Orphan Asylum, on May 8th, the Prince of Wales said:—"We have had recently to congratulate ourselves on a short war—a brief campaign, which has been most successfully terminated—I allude to the Chitral campaign. (Cheers.) In that campaign the British and the native forces in India did their duty right manfully—(cheers)—and I think the spirit which has always existed amongst our soldiers has not in any way deteriorated, as has been so recently seen. (Cheers.)"

Is the "union of hearts" between India and Great Britain to be ratified, not in Parliament, but on the cricket-field? If so, the praise will be due to Mr. K. S. Ranjitsinhji. His first appearance, for Sussex against the M.C.C., was a triumph. He scored 77 not out in the first, and 150 in the second innings. He also took 6 wickets for 109 runs. The *Times* wrote of his performance:—"Everything was eclipsed by the fine batting of K. S. Ranjitsinhji, whose brilliant cutting and driving powers were sustained right through the two hours and a-half of his stay. The graceful precision of a powerful style greatly impressed both the general public and the members in the pavilion, and one of the oldest stagers at Lord's admitted its equality with many of the best things ever done on the ground. K. S. Ranjitsinhji certainly made a remarkable first appearance for his county, and after Saturday's feat it is better understood how quickly he acquired fame by his cricket at Cambridge. The fact that he made this 150 at the rate of a run a minute gives a good idea of the rapidity of his scoring. He went in second wicket down at 36, and was seventh out at 245, having hit two fives, 24 fours, five threes, and four twos. Messrs. Murdock and Newham gave him little aid, and when the fifth wicket went at 117 there was a probability of an easy and substantial win for the M.C.C."

Mr. Ranjitsinhji holds, at the time of writing, the third place in the list of first-class averages. He has scored 364 runs in five innings, and his average is 72·8.

The founders of the Pan-Indian Association, which has lately been established, declare that "within the last generation a combination of a set of causes have evoked forces, powerful almost as those of Nature, which are rapidly working to create a united and regenerated India. Feeling it to be the duty of every lover of India to devote himself to this work of regeneration, we have formed the Pan-Indian Association. India is at the present moment intimately linked with England. And England will be potent either for good or for evil in the moulding of India's destiny; the evil being the retardation of her inevitable progress towards a place in the first rank of nations. The peculiar work of the Pan-Indian movement in England will be to bring home to the British public the true state of things in India, that through ignorance of them the influence of England may not be for the evil."

The Association consists of gentlemen who are prepared both to speak at public meetings and to contribute to the Press on Indian political subjects. The Secretaries are Mr. P. Chaudhuri, and Mr. Jnanen N. Ray, 19 Tavistock Square, W.C. The Executive Committee consists of the Secretaries, and Messrs. Kumud Nath Chaudhuri, Jehander Ali Meerza, Niazuddin Khan, Deep Narayan Singh, Syed Aminuddin Ahmed Aschur, Muhammad Abdul Ghani, and Jyotish Ranjan Das.

BRITISH POLICY IN INDIA.

INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE.

The following instructive correspondence has passed between Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., and Colonel A. Parnell, the author of a book on British policy. It will be observed that Col. Parnell in his final letter is reduced to the admission that "in our national character there is too great a divorce of practice from precept."

25th March, 1895.

Dear Sir,—I have to thank you for sending me a copy of your "British Policy." It is a sad look-out for Britain and India when it is to be the policy—"In India we are *and ever must be* a despotic Military Power." Such an idea on the eve of the 20th century, after all the emancipating and glorious works of Britain during this century in the progress of mankind, after repeated and most solemn pledges and proclamations of more than sixty years, of equality of Indians with all other British subjects; of repeated professions of India to be governed for India's benefit! Is it then all a huge hypocrisy unworthy of the British? I can understand a Cæsar or an Augustus proclaiming such a thing. But where is that Roman Empire now? Never has an empire rested on brute force and never will. But while contemplating the grand schemes of developing military power of Britain in the East, what about the cost? Is that to be paid, as hitherto, by the helot or slave of the Indian of the "despotic Military Power," or is Britain going to pay for its own gain and glory? I have just glanced only at Chapter IV., "Our Eastern Empire." I do not know whether in any part of the book this fundamental question is at all considered.—Yours truly,

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Col. The Hon. Arthur Parnell.

1, St. Mathew's Road, St. Leonards, March 31, 1895.

Dear Sir,—I am much obliged for your letter of the 25th in regard to my work on "British Policy" which I had the honour to send you. In my remarks on India I had in my mind chiefly its defence by the sword from *external* sources of danger like Russia. And even as regards its domestic government you will, I think, agree with me that we (I mean the races of India as well as the native British) must always maintain a strong military force, virtually as police, to preserve order and liberty. I fully agree with you that self-government is the right of every British subject. But we must, I think, modify that principle in the various parts of the Empire, according to the dictates of our reason, to suit the peoples concerned. You know better than I what elements of disaffection exist, and probably always will, among the turbulent Native States not immediately under our rule. If the inhabitants of India were all of *your* race, culture and religion, there would, in my opinion, be no question about permitting India to govern itself.

As regards another point mentioned in your letter, it was not at all my intention to propose that any additional financial burden should be laid upon India. All I suggest is that the power and capacity of the India Office should be enlarged so as to embrace in its scope the affairs of the East generally, with India itself, so to speak, as a nucleus. For instance, I propose that the India and not the War Office, should have the control of the European army needed to reinforce the native troops; and that it should supply administrators to govern the eastern dependencies. Such a policy would, I imagine, greatly enlarge the sphere for the employment of educated natives and would tend to make India a more complete, self-dependent Asiatic power than it is at present.—Yours truly,

ARTHUR PARNELL.

Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., M.P.

4th April, 1895.

Dear Sir,—Thanks for your letter of 31st ult. The questions are simply these:—

1st. Are all the promises and pledges for past sixty-two years to treat us like, and raise us to the status of, British subjects, so many simple shams and delusions, or are they sincere? And though hitherto no honest attempt at all has been made, but on the contrary, the Indian authorities have invariably (except once partially, and that even afterwards cancelled), in the words of Lord Lytton, as Viceroy, adopted every device and subterfuge to make a dead letter of these pledges; is this to continue, and a military despotism, keeping us simply as helots, to be our future? Or is every effort to be *honestly* made to fulfil those pledges? If we are to remain simply subjects of despotism with the additional evils of that despotism being of aliens, which Macaulay describes as "the heaviest of all yokes is the yoke of the stranger," there is no hope either for us or for the British Empire. It will be the surest way of promoting the triumph of Russia. The good of the Empire and ourselves *entirely* depends, not upon brute force or any army, but upon the contentment and prosperity of India; and these depend *entirely* upon the honourable fulfilment of the pledges of sixty-two years.

2nd. Whatever of the Indian revenues is spent for protection inside or outside of India is as much (if not a great deal more, as I contend) for the benefit of Britain as for that of India. Should Britain, as simple justice between nation and nation, as between man and man, contribute its fair share of such expenditure or not? These two questions must be fairly and fully looked in the face by all honest Englishmen and honourably answered.

Whatever is the peculiarity of the condition of India has always been fully taken into account by the British statesmen and nation every time the pledges were made, and that was the special reason of these pledges, *i.e.*, to improve the political, social, and every other condition of civilisation of the Indians.

If this be not the mission of Britain in India, as it is always loudly proclaimed to be, then there is no reason for its existence in India, except that of simple greed for, and spoils of, conquest.

I appeal to men like you to consider these questions involving the weal or woe not only of the hundreds of millions of the human race, but even of that of the British themselves and their Empire. They can only sink or swim with the Indian Empire. Yours truly,

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Col. The Hon. Arthur Parnell,
1, St. Mathew's Road, St. Leonards.

1, St. Mathew's Road, St. Leonards, April 9th, 1895.

Dear Sir,—I am much obliged for your letter of the 4th, and I fully sympathise with you in all your wishes and hopes for the advancement and benefit of India. I wish that I was more competent to discuss the matter with you, but my personal knowledge of India is confined to about two years' residence there thirty years ago, and I am not well posted in its politics or in any recent measures connected with its internal administration. I am afraid that in our national character there is too great a divorce of practice from precept, and that we say a great deal more than we intend. There is much hypocrisy and dishonesty in our public doings. We are led by an anonymous press, and are almost incapable of thinking for ourselves on Imperial and Indian matters.—Yours truly,

A. PARNELL.

Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., M.P.

DINNER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESS.

In honour of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., as President of the Tenth Indian National Congress, held at Madras in December last, a party of Indian gentlemen resident in Great Britain gave a dinner on May 4th at the Westminster Palace Hotel. Mr. D. Naoroji, M.P., presided, and there were present with the guest of the occasion Mr. A. C. Morton, M.P., Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P. (Durham), Mr. Cremer, M.P., Mr. George Howell, M.P., Mr. Wilson, M.P. (Govan), Mr. A. Ghani, Mr. H. Roberts, M.P., Mr. A. Sen, Mr. Byles, M.P., Mr. Peter Paul Pillai, Mr. J. F. X. O'Brien, M.P., Mr. K. W. Bonnerji, Dr. T. M. Nair, and Mr. H. Mullick, hon. secs. Many of the company appeared in Indian costume.

After dinner letters were read regretting absence from Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., Mr. J. Dillon, M.P., Mr. Herbert Paul, M.P., Mr. Stansfeld, M.P., etc. Sir W. Wedderburn was unfortunately prevented from being present owing to the death of his sister.

In the course of the toasts, after that of "The Queen

Empress," Dr. NAIR, proposing "Parliament and the Parliamentary Committee," held that India wanted democratic reforms, and was only likely to get them from the House of Commons.

Mr. A. C. MORTON, responding, would not say whether the British ought to be in India, but being there they ought to govern in the interests of the Indian people. He hoped to see the time when the Radicals in Parliament would be able to help the people of India to get what was called Home Rule. (Loud cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN, giving the health of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., spoke of the kindness and readiness with which he consented to go out to India to preside at the Congress. The Indian people thus enabled one of the most respected and thoughtful of the Irish members to assure his compatriots that they were justified in supporting the Indian national cause. He noted particularly their attention to the resolution proposed by Mr. Paul on Indian Civil Service Examinations. (Cheers.)

Mr. WEBB, on rising to acknowledge the compliment paid him, was hailed with hearty cheers. He assured his audience that whatever might be his fate in life, whether rich or poor, the vision of his visit to India would ever revert to him as a most gratifying and living reminiscence. (Cheers.) He had been amused since his return at being asked how he understood the language, his querists forgetting that as good English was spoken in India as in England, and that it was a prime means of bringing the two peoples together. As for the Congress he would adopt the words of Sir R. Garth in describing it as an important assembly of earnest and patriotic gentlemen, who in his (Mr. Webb's) opinion were working not for their own hand, but for the good of the people. (Cheers.) He expressed his sickening sorrow at the sad spectacle of the recent war—(hear, hear)—which he attributed to the all-pervading military system. He deprecated the attitude of superiority assumed by Englishmen in India, and he further deplored the neglect by a Liberal Government of Indian affairs. (Hear, hear.)

Other toasts were "India," given by Mr. J. Wilson and acknowledged by Mr. K. Chaudri and Mr. N. K. Khan; "The Land we live in and Central Finsbury," by Mr. H. Mullick, replied to by Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Byles, and Mr. Harper; "The Indian National Congress," by Dr. Murison, responded to by Mr. S. K. Mullick and Mr. M. A. Ghani; "Our Guests," by Mr. K. "Ghaswalla," and responded to by Mr. Howell and Mr. Martin Wood; and "The Chairman," proposed by Mr. H. Haridas.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

To the Editor of "INDIA."

SIR,—The article on "Indian Affairs" published in the *Times* of May 3rd, and doubtless reflecting the views of the Government regarding the enquiry into the expenditure of the Indian revenues, contains the following statements which deserve attention:—

> "Mr. Fowler consented to a full scrutiny of the charges on the Indian treasury, but restricted the scrutiny from Imperial matters, such as frontier arrangements or the policy which regulates wars and annexations."

The enquiry, therefore, is to exclude the expenditure incurred in the trans-frontier expeditions, that is, the main source of the financial difficulties and the increased taxation in India. Furthermore, the word "consented" in the above passage might create the impression that the proposed enquiry, although restricted, may nevertheless substantially fulfil the object for which an enquiry was asked for in August last. Such an impression would, however, be entirely erroneous, seeing that what the member for Flintshire chiefly asked for was "a Parliamentary investigation into the condition and wants of the Indian people and their ability to bear their existing burdens"—questions which the Royal Commission is to be entirely precluded from investigating.

In another part of the *Times*' article it is said:

> "The ties which bind Great Britain to her colonies are not the ties of justice and fairness alone. Those ancient bonds are knit together not by conquest or annexation or treaty. But while India cannot expect from England the tenderness of a mother to her children, she may claim the generous treatment due to a great and loyal dependency."

These observations are irrelevant and uncalled for, seeing that India has claimed, not maternal tenderness or generosity, but the honest fulfilment of England's pledges to her—pledges on the faithful discharge of which depend alike the well-being of the Indian people and the honour of the English nation.

To deny to Her Majesty's Indian subjects an opportunity of substantiating the charges of oppression and injustice which they have repeatedly brought against the Indian Administration—an opportunity which would have been afforded by the Parliamentary investigation asked for by the member for Flintshire—must naturally create the belief that those charges cannot be refuted, and, at the same time, imbue the Indian people with the conviction that relief and redress are unattainable by them through legal steps and constitutional channels.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

May 20th. J. DACOSTA.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MAY, 1895.

ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW. Baden-Powell, B. H., "The Permanent Settlement of Bengal."

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW. Beauchamp, H., "The North-West Frontier."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). Candy, R. E., C.S.I., "Progress of Female Education in the Bombay Presidency;" Pope, G. N., Rev., D.D., "Leaves from an Old Indian's Note-Book."

JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL COLONIAL INSTITUTE. Younghusband, F. E., Capt., "On the Kashmir Frontier."

LIPPINCOTTS' MONTHLY. Larned, W. T., "Effacing the Frontier" (?)

UNITED SERVICE MAGAZINE. Marsh, P., Surgeon-Major, "Enteric Fever: The Scourge of India."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

MAY, 1895.

HANNA, Colonel H. B. .... "Can Russia Invade India?" (A. Constable.)	2s. 6d.
"Map to Illustrate the Chitral Expedition in North-West India." Second edition. (W. and A. K. Johnston.)	0s. 6d.
KAYE, Sir J. W., and HOLMES, T. R. E. .... "Lives of Indian Officers." 3 vols. Third Edition. (W. H. Allen and Co.) Each vol.	6s. 0d.
KLEIN, AUGUSTA .... "Among the Gods. Scenes of India, with Legends by the Way." Illustrated. (Blackwood.)	15s. 0d.
"Great Britain's Colonial and Indian Possessions." (John Walker and Co.)	1s. 0d.
HUNT, Major S. LEIGH, Madras Army, and KENNY, ALEX. S., M R.C.S. ...... "Tropical Trials, A Handbook for Women in the Tropics." ..	7s. 6d.
"On Duty under a Tropical Sun." (W. H. Allen.)	4s. 0d.
BARRY, Bishop ...... "England's Mission to India." (S.P.C.K.)	3s. 0d.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, JUNE, 1895.

NOTES ON THE INDIAN BUDGET.

BY A. J. WILSON.
(City Editor of the *Standard*; Editor of the *Investor's Review*.)

The Vice-regal Government of India is always patching and mending its form of accounts, but there is one change it never makes. It does not present a clear completed account for one year and an equally clear set of estimates for the next. Instead, there is a series of accounts at three separate stages of development dragged along year after year to the great benefit, perhaps, of a Finance Minister's speculative imagination, but of no possible advantage to any one else in the world. In pre-telegraph days there might have been some, though not great, excuse for this clumsy system, but now there is none, and it is unnecessarily ridiculous that, by the existing multiplicity of statements, the completed accounts for the year ended 31st March, 1894, should only be disclosed to India and England in the end of March, 1895. If the Government of India is not able to place a tolerably exact record of its previous year's income and spendings before the world at the fiscal year's end, then let the date of the Budget Statement be changed to April or May, so that we may get only two sets of figures—the finished accounts for the year completed in the previous March, and the first and final estimate for the year just entered upon. By the present arrangement there must be a great waste of clerical labour and it tends to looseness in expenditure and patch-and-mend book-keeping. What is the good of compiling a, presumably, careful Budget into which every probable item of income and outgo is brought on the threshold of a new year when at the end of it the Finance Minister can, with the coolest air in the world, give us a second Budget, adding here and deducting there, which he calls his "Revised Estimate"? The system is indefensible except on the ground that it enables the Executive to hide what it is doing.

Sir James Westland followed the usual plan in his preliminary budget excursus of 21st March last, and his opening statement enables us to see, by comparing it with previous efforts in the same line, how the trick works. "The revised estimates for 1893-94," said he, "which I presented last year worked out a deficit of Rx. 1,792,800, the actual result in making up the accounts is a deficit of Rx. 1,546,998, being Rx. 245,802 better than the estimate." But the original budget estimate of Sir David Barbour for the same year put the deficit at Rx. 1,595,100 so that he was nearer the actual outcome by almost Rx. 200,000 than his successor found himself twelve months after the budget had been originally drawn up. What was the use of all this estimating and re-estimating in such circumstances? The only result it can have is to lead people to suppose that nothing is ever to to be counted on in Indian Finances, except extravagance. The succeeding year 1894-95, Sir James Westland says, was going to come with a surplus of nearly ten million rupees instead of the deficits of between three and twenty-one millions, according to the dates at which the sums in addition and subtraction were worked out. Well, we should have been glad if the Government had been frightened the whole year through by the prospect of a big deficit. It might have spent less and had something now in hand to help to pay for the Chitral war. As matters are, the Government confesses by its successive estimates and "Budgets" that it really carries on a speculative undertaking. Sometimes luck helps it, sometimes not, but it plunges along hoping that the Exchange will go in its favour, or that a rise will take place in opium, or that it will escape a famine and by one means or another come out approximately right-side-up in the end.

Most of the expected surplus for 1894-5 is, on the Finance Minister's own confession, no genuine surplus at all. He got, or hoped to get, over nine million rupees more by opium, and he saved six millions by reduced payments to opium cultivators or 15,414,000 rupees in all, and these results are the product of a decaying business and of a depletion of stock. Cultivators of the opium poppy have been underpaid and have reduced the acreage planted, and the Government has reduced its stock of opium from the standard 57,000 chests to *nil*. "The reserve of opium is absolutely exhausted," says Sir James, and the gain of the year in sale proceeds has come from enhanced prices alone. These enhanced prices increase the effectiveness of competition and endanger the whole revenue from this source, and now the Government as the result of under-payment of the cultivators and artificial enhancement of the price has to try to regain its old position by lowering the price of the drug and raising the allowance to the poppy-grower. We cannot call surpluses healthy which are thus produced. As for the "improvement" obtained by the new customs and excise duties on cotton fabrics, the less said the better for they promise to be the last straw.

It is more pleasant to take note of Sir James Westland's happiness of mind over the reduction in the military expenditure. We look for this reduction but cannot find it. It seems the Government did "save" three and three-quarter million rupees in the commissariat department by cheap food and fodder, and there were "other savings," not specified, presumably equally accidental and transitory, but against them have to be set an increase, which will be permanent and expansive, of nearly six and a-half million rupees in additional pay to British troops in India, the cost of the Waziri Expedition, etc., and the whole of the latter is not included in the outgoings of the year. Here is the leak which will by-and-by empty the reservoir. Thanks to the "scientific frontier" legend, and to the never-ending little wars it draws us into all round our far too disbanded border lines, thanks to the unchecked rapacity of the English War Office which systematically "scoops" India much as British privateers used to lighten treasure-ships on the Spanish main, our unhappy dependency has now to pay more than two hundred and fifty million rupees per annum for the maintenance of the army which holds it in subjection. This is more than a rupee per head for the population directly under British rule, and upwards of 45 per cent. of the entire revenue of India from the land rents, and opium, and every form of taxation. This does not, so far as we can judge, include the charge for all the pensions, which might be properly placed to the army account, nor the cost of the "military works" which the Government is continually wasting money upon.

The load imposed by the army alone has increased by fully fifty million rupees a year in ten years' time and it must, in the nature of things, continue to grow while the present policy is followed. This Chitral Expedition, for instance, will probably mean a permanent addition to our military expenditure of two or three millions a year, over and above its initial cost which no one can yet forecast, but which may well be fifty millions of rupees. And the worst of it is that the mere direct cost of the army is not nearly all for which the people of India have to pay, as the result of the fuss and push and muddle which now mark our dealings with outlying tribes. Most of the State railway expenditure, with its steady addition to the fixed charges of the Government—charges payable in England—has to be carried to the same account. "Capital outlay" of this sort is put at fifty-two millions rupees for 1894-95 and at forty-four millions for the current year. As there is little or no net return from most of this expenditure it ought really to be debited to revenue. But in that case where would any chance of "surpluses" be in our time? Putting together the cost of the army and other charges for debt interest, interest on railway capital, for pensions and furlough allowances, and including "works" and railway annuities—a small part of which represents redemption of capital—we reach a total of over 492½ million rupees, and the gross income of the State from every source is estimated for the current year at something less than 970 million rupees. From the latter total, however, we must deduct the cost of collection, including the working expenditure of the Post Office, etc., the working expenses of the State railways and canals, say 245 million rupees. This leaves little more than 233 million rupees for the domestic or civil expenditure of the Empire. No wonder that the Famine Fund has had to be suspended and that the Government is always at its wits' end for money.

We have dropped the "tens of rupees" mode of stating these totals. The people of India do not count in that way. A native infantry soldier has hitherto been paid only seven rupees a month and is now to have but nine. Not much chance of counting by tens for him, nor yet for the classes from which he is drawn. The true significance of the cost of our Government to India can never be grasped until we bring the total amount of it side by side with the probable revenue of the mass of the people in the currency to which they are accustomed. A sum of ninety-six millions of "tens of rupees" looks small for so large a country, but call it 960 millions straight out, and remember that the average earnings of the inhabitants is probably not much over 100 rupees per family, per annum, and the load begins to wear its true proportions.

The Finance Minister is very happy over the reduction effected in the debt charges by the conversion of the rupee loans last year, and has every reason to be; but this reduction—a mere five and a-quarter million rupees—does not help the people of India at all. The saving is more than swallowed up by the steady growth in the general expenditure—a growth which has obliged the Government to appropriate the taxes specially and most solemnly dedicated to famine prevention works expenditure, as well as to hide in its preliminary estimates for the current year all mention of the cost of the Chitral War beyond a paltry million and a-half of rupees set aside to meet the preliminary cost of fitting out the expedition. Only by such unworthy devices is it possible to chirrup about a "surplus" or to prophecy that, beyond renewing the £2,000,000 of floating debt in London, there will be no borrowing operations there this year. This is a prophecy in which we have no faith. Through a series of events wholly beyond the control of India, the India Council has lately been able to sell its drafts unusually well on the London market, disposing, not only of all it required to make up the tale of £17,000,000, but doing so at rather better prices for the rupee than could have been obtained had no speculative rise occurred in silver. A continuance, however, of the higher prices for silver and of the conformity of the Indian exchanges with that price must tend to derange the export trade of India, and that trade, at its very best, is not sufficiently in excess of the imports to allow the Council to continue to draw freely without endangering a fall in the rupee, through time, to 10d., or even to 6d. The chronic exchange troubles, over which Indian finance ministers weep so much without ever opening their eyes to see what they mean, will soon reappear more aggravated than ever, because expenses, both Home and Indian, must continue to expand whether the Chitral War is paid for by a new loan or not. By borrowing alone can the semblance of solvency be kept up. On these grounds we quite expect to see the Viceregal Government in the London market again before this year is out. It cannot otherwise keep itself alive. Happily it can borrow on easy terms in sterling—at rather less than 6 per cent. to the Indian taxpayer—because it is a law of the money market that steady borrowers secure the best terms by use and wont, whether solvent or not; but this fortunate circumstance only tempts the Government on to its destruction—to a composition with its creditors. That is the best end possible for an individual who goes on borrowing but never pays back, and we see no reason to suppose that a better can befall an empire.

How much the total debt of India has grown in the last ten years or so we cannot exactly tell because it is so artfully split up into debt in India—*i.e*, rupee debt mostly held in the United Kingdom or by banks in India whose profits are sent home—debt in England, and railway capital, which is equally a burden of tribute on the Indian producer. We can, however, say how the sterling charges payable by India in England through the Secretary of State have expanded. They amounted to only £7,000,000 in 1870 and they are now tamely accepted by the financiers and rulers of India as a normal minimum of £17,000,000. Keep away the effects of constant loans and the total would be more than £20,000,000 per annum, or a burden on the Indian people, at the last year's rate of exchange, of more than 350,000,000 rupees per annum. And Mr. Fowler, cheery, ignorant optimist that he is, thinks India flourishes and pays her debts! The truth is that the real expansion of India's debt in the last twenty years has been partly hid by the substitution of terminable annuities for the capital of three of the railways built under the State guarantee. Over £16,000,000 has thus been hid away since 1879, and still the debt of India under all heads has, since that date and down to 1890-91, increased by more than £90,000,000 nominal; really, at the present value of the rupee, by a great deal more. There is but one end to this kind of progress, come it soon, come it late.

Other points in Indian finance and Sir James Westland's statement would well repay dissection, but space and time forbid. We have said nothing at all about the local burdens of India which now amount to nearly, if not quite, forty millions of rupees per annum. But we may note the fog Sir James is in at the exports of gold. Silver is pouring in, gold is flowing out, he does not know why. The reason is, we fancy, plain enough. An attempt is being made to give silver as "money" a fictitious value in India as against gold. It, therefore, drives out the gold because, so long as the importer of silver can exchange that metal for gold at a price profitable to himself, he will bring the silver into the country and buy the gold with it to be exported. Why cannot the Government, in need of taxes, clap a 20 per cent. duty on silver to stop this and give one more signal instance of its wisdom?

A. J. Wilson.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

By H. N. Haridas, F.I.In.

(Secretary of the Surat Congress Committee.)

The Secretary of State for India has after all redeemed his pledge by appointing a Royal Commission to enquire into the administration and management of the civil and military expenditure of India, and into the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India. Mr. Fowler may think that he has succeeded, by a cleverly worded reference, in limiting the scope of enquiry by the Commission. He declared in the House of Commons that he would carefully, to the best of his ability, guard against any enquiry into the policy of annexation and aggression so wantonly indulged in by a clique of officials in India. The Commission has nothing to do with the aims and objects of the authorities, who have always shown fear of full public enquiry. Whatever the Imperial policy may be the Commission is not concerned with it. Its members cannot put a single question to any witness with a view to ascertaining the wisdom or the folly of certain measures. But the Commission can, I think, enquire into the exact legal status of the Government of India; and if it is to do its work carefully it will have to ascertain exactly the legal liabilities and capacities and the nature of that indescribable and unknowable body. When a searching enquiry is made by the Commission with this object in view, the questions of the scientific frontier, and annexation, and aggressive wars beyond the frontiers will be more questions of the legality of the transactions entered into by the Indian authorities than questions of Imperial policy. When the legal problem is once settled the problem of apportionment will not be half so difficult as it now appears to be.

Unlike the Executive Government of this country, the Government of India is the creature of an Act of Parliament.[1] The authorities that are responsible for the good government of that country, which is sometimes called a dependency, are invested with a trust for an indefinite time, and hence in law they are by implication made a Corporation.[2] This being so, when we examine the action and policy of the Government of India we must enquire if they be *intra vires* and legal. A corporate body constituted by statute for certain purposes, like the Government of India (which in respect of its legal character does not differ from an ordinary Corporation like the County Council or the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway Company), is regarded as so entirely the creature of the statute that acts done by it without the prescribed formalities, or for objects foreign to those for which it was formed, would be in general null and void.[3] The Royal Commission ought therefore to ascertain, in the first place, what exactly is the extent of the territories legally vested in the Government of India—in other words, what is the India of whose expenditure they are asked to examine the administration and management. The statute has defined India. For the purposes of the statute (21 and 22 Vict., cap. 106, sec. i.) India means the territories vested in Her Majesty by the statute, or those territories which may be vested in Her Majesty in virtue of such rights as the old East India Company could have legally exercised before it ceased to exist in 1858. The Government of India has no jurisdiction over any territory which is not strictly India as defined by this Act of Parliament. Yet, strange to say, India, as now ruled over by the Viceroy extends in limits far beyond the India that was transferred to Her Majesty in 1858. A good many new territories have been since annexed and incorporated in the British India of to-day. The Commission will be only doing its duty if it demands authentic maps of the territories first vested in the Indian Government and then makes full enquiry into the history of these annexations and ascertains clearly the right or rights by which this Corporation has encroached upon the territories that it now claims as its own. That is to say, the Commission should clearly ascertain the right or rights which the old East India Company could have legally exercised in relation to such territories and in virtue of which only the annexations and extensions could have been justified in law. Having ascertained the extent of the territories which constitute India in the strict legal sense of the term—and I am confident that if thorough enquiry be made, much of that portion of the British Empire which is called India will be proved to be not India, and hence not within the purview of the incorporating statute—the Commission can then ascertain what exactly are the purposes of the Government of India contemplated by law. The revenues of India are to be applied and disposed of for the purposes of the Government of India alone and not for any other purpose whatever.[1] Next comes the question of military operations beyond the external frontiers of India. Parliament has in distinct terms laid down that not a penny shall be charged to the Indian revenues for such operations without the consent of both Houses of Parliament.[2] Any such charge created without due authority is void in law. If money has been spent without due legal authority, the Commission can trace it and insist upon its being paid back to India. It will thus be seen that in order to ascertain whether certain Indian expenditure has been *intra vires*, the Commission must examine the history of the transactions beyond the frontiers, must enquire into the annexations, and must ascertain the necessity of the various measures (miscalled "policy") which have been adopted by the authorities both in India and in England. So far as the Government of India is concerned there cannot be any legitimate policy which is not included within the four corners of the incorporating statute. As regards expenditure incurred simply to carry out an Imperial policy the Imperial treasury alone is strictly liable.

HARDEVRAM NANABHAI HARIDAS.

THE HOME CHARGES AND THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

BY T. LLOYD.

If one were asked to offer some suggestions to the Royal Commission which is to enquire into the expenditure of the Indian revenues, he would probably begin with the Home Charges. The finances of India would be in a far less unsatisfactory state were it not for this annual drain of sterling expenditure. India has made considerable progress during the present century and especially during the past thirty years. In many directions, no doubt, there is waste, there is room for retrenchment, there is need for reform. But, to speak broadly and generally, India could well afford not only her present expenditure but even a larger expenditure, if it were raised differently and laid out differently, and above all if she had not to pay in London such an enormous sum every year in gold. The Home Charges vary. Sometimes they reach nearly 19 millions. Sometimes they are as low as 16 millions, accordingly as the India Council does or does not borrow in London. It may be said, however, in general terms that in one way or another India has to pay in London every year about 18 millions sterling in gold. But India raises her revenue in silver and in some way she has to exchange the silver for gold, or the equivalent of gold, in order to make the payments. As silver has been falling for nearly a quarter of a century, compared with gold, the cost of making those payments has steadily been increasing. To use the technical phraseology, India has been suffering every year a heavy loss by exchange; or, to use language more intelligible to the ordinary man, India has to raise more and more rupees every year in order to make the stated payments in gold in London. The Government of India has suffered heavily. So, too, have all persons in India who have to send money to England. So great has been the outcry that the mints have been closed and India has been deprived of any real standard of value at all. Her whole currency has been thrown into disorder in the vain hope that she may escape from this dreaded loss by exchange. The measure adopted was utterly unwise. What the Government of India ought to have done was not to meddle with the currency, which was an exceedingly good currency, but in some way or other to get rid of as much of the Home Charges as possible. What I propose to do just now is not merely to point out that the Home Charges can be reduced, but to show the way in which the reduction can be effected.

---

[1] 21 and 22 Vict., cap. 106.

[2] Maxwell on Statutes, second ed., p. 429; also comp. Williams *v.* Lords of Admiralty, 12 C. B., 420; Q. L. M. and P., 456.

[3] Maxwell on Statutes, second ed., p. 361.

[1] 21 and 22 Vict., cap. 106, secs. 2 and 42.

[2] 21 and 22 Vict., cap. 106, sec. 55.

The Home Charges consist of four great items:—(i) payments for stores and materials of all kinds; (ii) payments to the British Government on account of the army and navy; (iii) interest upon the debt; and (iv) the salaries and pensions of officials. It is clear that the payments for stores and materials can be altogether got rid of. The present system is to buy the stores and materials in London through a Department immediately under the supervision of the India Council and to pay for them in London and in gold. But the Indian people themselves buy the European goods which they require—such, for example, as cotton piece goods—in India and pay for them in rupees. Why cannot the Government of India do what the Indian people in their individual capacity always do? There is nothing difficult in the matter. Our Colonial Governments and many foreign Governments buy in the way suggested. They issue specifications of the goods they require; they invite tenders to be sent in to them at their place of domicile; and they pay for the goods, when they are accepted, in the money of the country. What all foreign individuals do and what so many foreign and Colonial Governments do can be done by the Government of India. The reply which is usually made is that the present system is as good as any that can possibly take its place; that the greatest care is exercised by the Committee of the India Council within whose charge the matter is; and that the officials are highly trained experts and men of undoubted honesty. I need not discuss the questions whether the India Council anxiously superintends these transactions and whether the officials employed are men of the highest honour. It is not because I think the Council incompetent or doubt the honesty of the officials that I suggest the change. It is simply to escape from the necessity of having to pay so much gold in London every year. The value of the stores and materials varies. If there is active railway building, for example, more stores are required than when there is little railway building. Similarly in regard to warlike stores and everything else that the Government undertakes to supply. But roughly it may be said that the value of the stores and materials averages not far short of one-tenth of the whole of the Home Charges. Now, if the Home Charges could be cut down by a million and a-half or two millions sterling every year, that would be an immense advantage. The bills which the India Council has to sell in London would be reduced by that amount, which would certainly raise, or at all events tend to raise, the value of the rupee. I do not now urge that there would be much saving to the Government of India. As I am not disputing that the India Council and its officials perform their duty admirably, I assume that the price they pay for the stores is the just market price. If the stores were tendered for in Calcutta or Bombay an equivalent price, therefore, would have to be paid in rupees. The gain to India in this way would be, not a reduction in price, but a reduction in the Home Charges and consequently in the bills sold by the India Council. India would have to find, in plain language, about two millions sterling less of gold than she has to find at present, and that reduction would be of immense benefit to her.

The second item in the Home Charges consists of payments by the Indian to the British Government on account of the army and navy. When the direct government of India was assumed by the Queen it was decided that the old system of keeping a separate European force should be abolished and that the European army serving in India should be a portion of the Imperial army. Furthermore, it was decided that the naval service should be Imperial and not merely Indian. India of course has to pay for the army and navy which assist in protecting her. I am not at present concerned to enquire whether the naval and military forces are too large or whether the charges put upon India are too great. For the present purpose I shall assume that the interests of India have been honestly safeguarded, that she really does require such an army and such a navy as she has to pay for, my object being at present to show how the Home Charges can be reduced, not how retrenchment can be effected. India has not only to pay for the troops actually serving in India but also she has to contribute a portion of the cost of training the troops, and of the pensions. She has to pay the cost of the troop-ships, and she has to contribute to the navy. At present

India has to pay to the British Government the sums so due from her in gold or the equivalent of gold; and the means of payment are found by the sale of the Council's drafts. In round figures these payments somewhat exceed a million and a half sterling and, added to the payments for stores and materials, they would make between three and four millions sterling, or say from one-sixth to one-fifth of the Home Charges. If the Home Charges could be reduced by one-fifth or 20 per cent. it is clear that the advantage to India would be immense. She would, of course, have to pay equivalent sums, but she would pay those sums in silver and not in gold, and she would not have to sell bills in London that would realise, say, eighteen millions sterling every year. The bills she would have then to sell would be rather under fifteen millions. Now, it is clear that, just as the stores could be paid for in India, so the contributions on account of the army and navy could be made abroad and in silver, instead of at home and in gold. The Imperial Government employs both troops and ships in the silver-using parts of the world — in Hong-Kong, the Straits Settlements, the Chinese Seas, the Persian Gulf, and so on; and the Imperial Government has to send out the means of paying for the troops and the ships. Under the present system we require India to pay her contribution in London; to send the money from Calcutta to London; and then we require the Imperial Government to send it to the Persian Gulf, Aden, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong-Kong, and elsewhere. Would it not be a much simpler plan to instruct the Government of India to remit the amounts due from it to the Home Government directly to the ports and stations in the silver-using countries? Would it not be as easy to pay for all the Imperial expenditure in the Persian Gulf and in the Pacific from India as from home? India then would remit in silver and the Home Charges would be correspondingly reduced, while our own expense in remitting would be removed altogether or greatly diminished. Of course, it is said that the present system works admirably; that it has been elaborated during many years; that it is brought now as near perfection as possible; and that a change would only do harm. We are accustomed to protestations of this kind from officials all over the world. Everything that is established is naturally, in their eyes, as near perfection as possible. But the ordinary man is not content to take the assurances of officials as gospel, and will refuse to believe that officials could not be found to do the work as well in India as in London.

The last two items in the Home Charges are interest on debt, and salaries and pensions. These, of course, cannot be reduced immediately. Whatever engagements India has entered into, either with her creditors or with the officials who have served her, she must necessarily carry out. But she could at least avoid increasing these two items, and she might gradually decrease them by a different policy. For instance, if she were to borrow at home instead of in London, there would be no further growth in the interest on debt in London. There would, of course, be a growth in India. But the payments would be made in silver and, what is still more important, they would be made in the country itself. Let us suppose that India were to borrow such a sum as would involve the payment of interest amounting to a quarter of a million sterling every year. It would be a matter of very great importance whether the quarter of a million sterling was sent altogether out of the country or was paid in the country. In the former case there would be a drain from the country. In the latter case the money that would be taken from the taxpayers would be paid to the creditors, and there would be a quarter of a million sterling every year which the creditors might use either in business or in increasing their comforts. In either event they would give employment to more labour and would stimulate industry. It would, therefore, be possible immediately to reduce the Home Charges by about one-fifth, and it would gradually become possible to reduce them perhaps by as much more by ceasing to borrow in London whenever possible, and by altering the arrangements which have hitherto been in force with regard to officials. The official mind is naturally indisposed to changes of this kind. They are, it is said, too sweeping; they disturb the course of business; and they throw people out of employment. But the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure ought to be above such considerations as these. It ought to look singly to the interests of India, and it ought to recommend whatever, upon full enquiry, it finds to be conducive to those interests.

T. LLOYD.

INDIAN TRADE AND TRADE IN INDIA.

[FROM A CORRESPONDENT.]

III.

In the last article on this subject, which appeared in the November number of this journal, attention was called to the possibilities of the fruit trade of India. The abundance and the variety of Indian fruits are proverbial, and it is well known that a moderate amount of care bestowed on their culture would speedily develop many marketable kinds. It is true that there are a large number of inferior fruits in India which could never become articles of profitable export, but the number of those which could be exported in some condition or other is by no means inconsiderable. Some of them, such as the grapes from Afghanistan, are peculiarly fine in flavour, and there are several varieties of these grapes which have never yet found their way to Europe. The size and flavour of some of them would command a price which would return a fair profit after careful packing and transport. The apples and the pears of Kashmir are famous for their delicacy and beauty. But, of course, fruit of this kind requires special appliances for its proper transit. This, however, is not the case with peaches, which grow to great perfection on the Nilgiris and in Bengal, or with apricots, which thrive in Afghanistan, Kashmir, and Chamba. These fruits can be crystallized readily and cheaply in a country like India, where sugar grows in every cottage garden, and the crystallized fruit can be safely conveyed to any distance. The root of ginger, which is cultivated in all the provinces of India, admits of a large extension of trade by crystallization or preservation in syrup on the plan pursued by the Chinese. Apricots can also be dried, and so can pears, and in this form they can be sent to any distance without damage. One advantage of sending such fruit in the dried or simply crystallized state is that decorated boxes are not needed. If the fruits are packed in simple wooden boxes, lined with clean paper, it is sufficient for the voyage, and on reaching England they can be repacked in any way that may be desired. It will surprise stay-at-home Indians to hear that the retail price for crystallized apricots in London is Rs. 3 12a. per *seer*, and dried apricots sell for Rs. 1 14a. per *seer*.

The peach is another fruit which is much esteemed in Europe though little eaten by Indians. It is indigenous on the Himalayas, and occurs in every village of the North-West Himalayan mountains. The peach is also frequent throughout the plains, and admirable peaches are produced even in the neighbourhood of Calcutta. The Persians have a way of drying peaches, and threading them on strings. In this way they can be carried for long distances, and preserve their flavour for months. They could be simply dried and packed in boxes, and there can be little doubt, considering the cheapness with which they could be grown in India and the good price they would command in England, that satisfactory profit would be made by trading in them.

The cheapness of pineapples in India, where they are sold by retail at the rate of four or five a penny, renders them a good article of trade. They can be boiled in syrup, and sent to Europe in tins. The hard outside portion of the pineapple should be cut off, and the fruit cut into thick slices. Reasonably large tins might be used for this purpose; because the small tins, in which pineapples are usually sent from the West Indies, are not infrequently opened by salesmen in England, and the fruit is taken out and sold by weight. Ordinarily each pineapple comes in a separate tin; but if the tins are to be opened and the fruit is to be sold by weight, the size of the exporting tin, within moderate limits, is immaterial. The leaves of the pineapple yield an excellent fibre, which can be extracted by steeping in water for eighteen or twenty days.

India produces many other fruits than those to which the attention of our Indian friends is herein directed, but none of them are now used for export. The truth seems to be that, as these fruits are exceedingly cheap in India, it never occurs to the Indian trader that they might be dear in some other country, and that profitable trade often consists in taking an object from a place where it is cheap and selling it where it is dear. It is the unfortunate prejudice which Indians have against voyaging to foreign parts which prevents them from knowing what the inhabitants of the rest of the world want, and the prices they are willing to give. The people of India make no commercial use whatever of their bamboos, which grow in the wildest profusion throughout the length and breadth of the land. The Japanese by coming to Europe and residing there saw the numerous useful purposes to which bamboo canes could be applied in the West, and, in the course of a few years, they have built up a vast industry, from which their country is deriving great advantage. This instance shows that even what appears to be a contemptible object can be made highly profitable when people know how to use it.

It is not only the better kinds of fruit which are useful, but some of the uneatable species have considerable value. The sour oranges and lemons of India are the best kinds for the manufacture of lemon-juice. There are species of *khatta*, or sour oranges, which are sometimes called *karna* in Northern India, and grow freely in the vicinity of Gonda, Etawa, Multan, Lucknow, and Calcutta, which can be used for manufacturing the well-known candied orange and lemon peel of commerce. This is produced by cutting the fruit into quarters from top to bottom; the pulp is removed and placed in a vessel, and squeezed to produce lemon-juice. The quarters of peel are then thrown into cold water to soften. They are then boiled until they become tender. Next they are placed in cold water for two days, care being taken to renew the water two or three times each day. Then they are allowed to drain. Sugar is now boiled until pearl-like bubbles form on the surface, and then the sugar is allowed to cool until it becomes tepid. The drained peel is placed in the sugar, and allowed to remain in it for eight days, care being taken to remove the pieces of peel every day, to re-boil the sugar until pearl-like bubbles form on its surface, and to replace the peel when the sugar becomes tepid. On the eighth day the sugar should be re-boiled as before, and the peel should simmer in the hot sugar, until, when a little of the sugar is cooled, it is found to crumble in the fingers into a flour-like powder. Then the peel should be quickly removed, and drained and cooled on sieves or similar surfaces. Finally the pieces of peel should be dried in a slow oven, or in the sun on dishes protected from the flies by wire covers, or similar appliances. Large quantities of this candied peel are annually imported into India, the whole of which could be made on the spot, giving rise to a very simple and profitable industry.

Jamaica sends to England about 45,000 gallons of lime-juice every year, and as it is a refreshing, cooling drink, and anti-scorbutic, there will always be a large demand for it. It is made from the wild lemon (*Pahari nimbu*) which is found in India, and can be easily cultivated. The peel is cut off in three thick slices, so as to leave the pulp in the middle three-cornered in shape with a bit of peel at each end. The pulp is cut across the middle, squeezed so as to press out the juice, and then strained in order to free it from the seeds and bits of skin. It is then filtered. To prevent spontaneous decomposition the juice is gently boiled in a copper vessel, care being taken not to scorch or burn the juice, because that destroys its pleasing acidity. The more the juice is condensed by this process the more valuable it becomes. It is exported in clean bottles. The wholesale price of lemon-juice is 10 annas per gallon, and as the process of manufacture is childishly simple, that price is found to yield a good profit. The juice of the sour orange can be prepared in the same way, and this sells for as much as 20 to 25 annas per gallon.

The profit on lime-juice manufacture is greatly increased by extracting the oil from the pieces of peel cut off from the fruit. They are allowed to remain one day in the vessel in which the workman has thrown them. On the second day he places a flat piece of clean soft sponge in his left hand, one end of which is wrapped round his forefinger. With his right hand he places on the sponge one of the pieces of peel with the outside downwards. He then squeezes it gently so as to make the inside portion rise up a little, and this cracks the minute vesicles in the skin, and the oil comes out on the sponge. Four or five squeezes are all that the workman gives to each bit of peel, and he takes care not to squeeze any bit of pulp which may be attached to it. As the sponge gets saturated with the oil, the workman wrings it forcibly, and receives its contents in a wooden vessel. In this the oil gradually separates from the watery liquid which accompanies it, and is poured off carefully into bottles. It sells at a very high price, about Rs. 250 per *seer*. The process is tedious, but is well suited to patient Indians, and is found to be a profitable industry in Italy where wages are much higher than they are in India.

Neroli oil is another product of the bitter oranges found wild in India. It is produced by distilling the white petals of the flowers in water, and cooling the steam as it passes through a pipe. The liquid which results consists of highly scented water, with the peculiar oil of the orange floating on the top. This Neroli oil is a delicious perfume, selling for Rs. 250 per *seer* when it is carefully made. The water is sold separately, under the name of Orange-Flower Water, for 20 or 25 annas per gallon. There are three kinds of orange-flower water—one made from the flowers themselves, as just described, another produced by mixing distilled water with Neroli oil, a third made by distilling the leaves, the stems, and the unripe fruit of the orange tree.

It will thus be seen that the wild oranges of India, of which there is an immense variety, totally neglected, could easily be converted into sources of commercial profit. The manufacturing processes which are involved are exceedingly simple, and require no machinery or expensive plant. Scores of suitable varieties of orange and lemon grow wild, and could therefore be cultivated at very slight expense. A few wooden bowls, one copper vessel, a simple still, and a few bits of sponge, are all the apparatus required. The demand for bottles for the lime-juice would stimulate that nascent industry. The price of superior bottles for the oil would be immaterial, as the value of the oil is so great that it would allow a good price to be paid for the small number of bottles required to convey it. The small bulk of these products in comparison with their value renders them well suited for transit to great distances. Our Indian friends will thus see that there are simple industries within their reach which involve little or no capital, and in no way offend against their social prejudices.

INDIA AND THE NATIONAL REFORM UNION.

[BY A MEMBER OF THE UNION.]

The meeting held in Manchester on May 1st under the auspices of the National Reform Union was, as the *Manchester Guardian* said next day, peculiarly opportune, and the news from the Chitral expedition which appeared in the papers during that week—both before and after the meeting—served as an admirable object-lesson of the principles which the speakers enunciated—principles which both Mr. Stanhope, the President, and Mr. Symonds, the Secretary of the Union, showed to be strictly in accord with the advanced Liberal creed which the organisation has always professed. It is noteworthy that three successive Presidents of the Union—Mr. Slagg, Mr. Schwann, and Mr. Stanhope—have identified themselves with this question of the good government of India. Opportune the meeting certainly was; but it was not opportunist. For, apart from its general policy on such questions, the Union decided by a special resolution passed at the Westminster Conference last summer to take up the question of the administration of the affairs of India.

Nor must the action of the Union in this matter be regarded as solely or even mainly a Lancashire movement, in spite of the fact that the recent meeting was held in the district and county which are most affected by the imposition of the Cotton duties. As just stated, the decision to include the Indian question in its programme was taken by the Union last summer, long before it was anticipated that those duties would be sanctioned by Mr. Fowler.

The value, therefore, of the meeting can only be fully realised by an appreciation of the fact that it gave public expression to the opinions held and promulgated by the members of a great political organisation, whose special function has been and is to educate the electorate of Great Britain in principles which it desires to see embodied in legislation and carried out in policy.

Tenacious as Englishmen are of their rights and privileges and interests, they are *au fond* both generous and just, and have shown themselves capable of making great self-sacrifices and submitting to severe trials and hardships in causes which commended themselves to their instinct of justice. For a proof of this we need look no further back than the period of the American Civil War, when the people of Lancashire submitted patiently to intense suffering and severe privations, and steadfastly refused to join the party which sought to make England side with the South against the North, because they regarded the former as the champions of slavery. Yet these are the people who are accused of wishing to sacrifice the poor rayats of India to their own selfish trade-interests. Those who make this charge neither know the men of Lancashire nor understand the grounds on which so many Radicals condemn the Government of India.

The position taken up by the National Reform Union is one which ought to commend itself to all sound Liberals. The Indian Government is met year by year with a recurring deficit, to meet which it has tried every possible expedient save the very obvious and proper one of retrenchment in expenditure. The Finance Minister, Sir J. Westland, did indeed state in his Budget last year that one of the modes by which he hoped to reduce the deficit was by "stringent economy in expenditure." But readers of India know what that economy amounted to and in what departments it was exercised. They know, too—and it is the object of the National Reform Union to make it known to the whole country—that no trifling economies of such a character are of any use, and that as the increase of expenditure is almost entirely due to the "forward" military policy on the North-West frontier, so the only possibility of reduction lies in the abandonment of that policy.

But it is not merely to the expenditure that politicians like Mr. Stanhope and the members of the National Reform Union object, but to the policy itself. When that "prancing pro-consul," Lord Lytton, was sent out to India by Lord Beaconsfield, and deliberately instructed to pick a quarrel with the Amír of Afghanistan, they uttered their protest against the iniquity of such a policy, and heartily supported Lord Hartington in his repudiation of it. His indignant question—"What right have we to be there?"—they now repeat in reference to Gilghit and Chitral, and they refuse to acquiesce in the continuance of a wrongful policy, simply because it is now pursued under the *ægis* of a Liberal instead of a Tory Government.

The responsibility of the possession and the government of India is not felt by the people of England; and the perfunctory manner in which the affairs of that great country are discussed in Parliament is an indication and a measure of popular ignorance and carelessness on the subject. Only when all eyes are turned to some centre of attraction, as to Chitral recently, do Englishmen seem to be even aware of the existence of India, and it needs some great and dangerous crisis to awaken their interest in it. Yet they talk glibly of its being "the brightest gem in the Crown" of their Sovereign, and lightly accuse all who try to warn them of the dangers of the policy they are pursuing of being "little Englanders" and supporters of the doctrine of "Perish India."

It is to save both England and India from the catastrophe that will inevitably come from such a policy that a few earnest Radicals have taken up this question; and the National Reform Union will have done no better work in the past than that to which it has now committed its organisation—namely, to instruct the electorate and enlighten public opinion on the vital importance of governing India on the sound Liberal principles of Peace, Retrenchment and Reform.

INDIA AND BRITISH CONSTITUENCIES.

IMPORTANT MEETING IN MANCHESTER.

In connexion with the National Reform Union, a meeting was held on May 1st, in the Gentlemen's Concert Hall in Manchester, to consider the civil and military expenditure in India. The chair was occupied by the Hon. Phillip Stanhope, M.P., who was supported by Sir William Wedderburn, Bart., M.P., Mr. Naoroji, M.P., Mr. R. Barlow, Mr. G. C. Mandleberg, Mr. J. Petrocockino, Mr. George Rhodes, Mr. T. C. Abbott, Mr. R. Ramsbottom, Mr. T. Eggington, Mr. G. W. B. Sanderson, Mr. A. C. Yates, Mr. Gordon Hewart, and Mr. A. G. Symonds (secretary).

Mr. C. E. Schwann, M.P., wrote:

> "I much regret that a previous engagement to speak in Salford to-night prevents me, as I should have wished, from being present with my colleagues, Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. D. Naoroji at your meeting to-night to consider the economies which may be practiced in the expenditure of India. Were it lightened, as it might well be, by the curtailment of border wars (so dear to the heart of the military "forward" party in our Indian Army as affording opportunities for earning distinction and promotion) and if the Indian Government had not listened to the clamour of Anglo-Indian officials and saddled the Indian nation with an additional one million pounds of taxation annually in order to compensate to some extent those officials for the loss in remitting part of their salaries to England at the reduced value of the rupee, probably the extreme step of putting a duty on certain cotton goods on entering India might have been averted. Nothing but good can arise to the Indian people and to ourselves through the examination of the financial position of India and the reforms which may seem practicable in the Indian Budget. The era of great expenditure in strategic railways ought surely now to come to an end. Our main security in India from the attacks of other nations is surely based on the contentment and prosperity of our fellow-subjects in that great country. But to produce that contentment we must not burden them with the cost of wars, either in Burma or elsewhere, which concern them or their interests but very indirectly."

Mr. C. H. Hopwood, M.P., wrote:

> "The meeting appears to me useful and well-timed. There seems to be an unwise action on the part of the Indian Government in meddling with the concerns of the tribes neighbouring the frontier. These interferences are prompted by military authorities, who are never backward in advising recourse to their weapons. Our expedition to Chitral, involving the expenditure of huge sums, and the indescribable hardships, wounds, and loss of life to so many brave men, attended with the public fear for months of some dreadful disaster, if not massacre, is sufficient example to support our argument that peaceful and moderate counsels are the best defence of India, and the effective, if not sole, cure for the poverty of her finances"

Mr. Thomas Snape, M.P., wrote:

> "I am quite in sympathy with the object of the meeting. A recent number of the *Indian Spectator* contains the following editorial remark, which I am sure will commend itself to the meeting: 'We in India, have no special liking for import duties on Manchester goods. We shall have no objection if the deficit that is facing us is met by contributions from the Exchequer, or if the deficit itself be removed by thorough-going retrenchment in the military department—nay, we shall hail such results with joy, and be for ever grateful to Lancashire if it is the means of bringing them on.' The excise duties also, by equalisation with those at home, might be made te add to the Indian revenue, to the advantage of our Indian fellow-subjects. I trust that one result of the meeting may be to lead the Indian authorities to devise other than the vicious methods of levying duties on imports for raising the revenue necessary to carry on the Government."

Mr. J. F. Cheetham wrote expressing regret at his inability to be present "upon an occasion which in view of the serious financial difficulties of the Indian Government, and the consequent reimposition of import duties must possess both for Lancashire and the country at large a very exceptional degree of interest and importance."

Letters apologising for absence had also been received from Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., Mr. Caleb Wright, M.P., Sir Joseph Leigh, M.P., and Mr. C. P. Huntington, M.P.

The Chairman said the meeting had been called primarily because of the interest recently renewed in Indian finance by the reimposition of import duties in that country, but the reimposition of those duties was not the subject they intended to discuss. Their contention had been, was, and would be, that those import duties—allowing them to be absolutely essential to balance the Indian Budget at the present moment—should not and would not be necessary if due economy was introduced into the military charges and also into the civil administration of India. In any event he did think that Mr. Fowler and the Government would have done well, if, before consenting to the reimposition of import duties of any description, whether upon cotton goods or other commodities, they had awaited an examination of the whole position of Indian finance by an independent Commission appointed for the purpose of seeing whether by the introduction of economies in various directions the reimposition of the import duties could not have been rendered unnecessary, and thus avoid what no one believing in the greatest facilities for commercial development between India and Great Britain could but regard as a most retrograde step. When Mr. Fowler was able to again devote his attention to public affairs, as they trusted he might be able to do soon, it was to be hoped that, in the first place, in consultation with those who were best fitted to advise him—the representatives of the various trades and manufacturing interests of Lancashire—he would, in accordance with his pledges on the subject, come to an understanding with the view of making the countervailing duties absolutely effective, so as to prevent the import duties becoming protective in any way whatever. But, more than that, they expected Mr. Fowler, in fulfilment of the promise he made in speaking on the motion of Mr. Samuel Smith, would take immediate steps to nominate a a Select Committee, or, if he wished it, a Royal Commission, which should have before it all the information at the disposal of the India Office, so that the whole question of Indian expenditure might be fairly and dispassionately considered. (Hear, hear.) The first of the points to which he desired to draw attention was our military policy on the North-west frontier. They were all proud of the gallant and heroic efforts of our troops in that region. (Cheers.) But was the policy pursued altogether judicious in the interests of India and of this country? In the past, as they were aware, mistakes had been made. The great Afghan campaign—glorious in a military sense—was a mistake in a political sense. It had now been found out that Lord Lawrence's policy was the right one and that our safety was best consulted by giving the Afghans the management of their own country and binding them by treaty to maintain our Imperial interests. (Hear, hear.) It was possible that a similar policy pursued with regard to the tribes with whom we had recently been involved would have avoided an enormous expenditure. Unfortunately the officers whom we sent to the north-west frontier, gallant and distinguished as they had undoubtedly proved themselves to be, were also, not perhaps unnaturally, anxious to show that they were made of the same metal as their fathers, and were not altogether indisposed to follow what had been called the forward policy. That policy was all very well where it was a wise policy, but countless millions had been spent and very many valuable lives had been lost, and we were not sure that as a consequence our defensive position had been improved. Then we had spent enormous sums in preparations for the future. No less than 15 millions had been spent in making strategical military railways. They might be permitted to ask whether most of the financial embarrassment of India did not arise from that great expenditure, and whether the commercial interests of India were not being prejudiced by it. (Hear, hear.) Another thing which had always impressed him was the way in which the War Office took advantage of the non-representative character of the Indian Government in order to square its own expenditure by thrusting upon the Indian Exchequer so large a portion of our military charges. So far as the great self-governing colonies were concerned they were able to take good care of themselves, and it certainly could not be argued that in contributing about ten per cent. of our military expenditure in connexion with our colonial possessions they had been unduly charged, but with India the position was entirely different. What were called the "Home" Charges for the British forces in India amounted to not less than £810,000. We also charged India £500,000 a year alone for training recruits, who went, it was true, for a few years to India, but who became soldiers of the Empire. (Hear, hear.) Another point worthy of consideration was the allowance we made to the Indian officials for the fall in the value of the rupee. This charge on the natives of India came to about a million a year; and it was to be observed that this Exchange Compensation Allowance, indefensible as he believed it to be upon general grounds, became especially so in the case of salaries not transmitted to Europe. It was facts like these which had caused a financial embarrassment in India, and had caused the reimposition of import duties on an article which was almost a primary necessity. An impartial enquiry, he believed, would show many extravagances of expenditure in India. That fact once disclosed, they might be sure of a return to commercial freedom in India. (Cheers.)

Sir **William Wedderburn**, M.P., said he was glad to have this opportunity of saying a few words at Manchester bearing on the question of the cotton duties. The two points he proposed to discuss were practical ones, and they were these:—1. How comes it that the cotton duties have been imposed? 2. What had we better to do in order to get rid of those duties? People in this country, he thought, were beginning to understand that the excessive and ever-increasing Indian expenditure was not only a question for the Indian taxpayer, but was also a question for the British taxpayer, and if it wer a question for the British taxpayer generally, much mor was it a question for those who supported the industries o Lancashire. Because there could be no doubt it was this excessive expenditure which had produced a deficit in Indian finance, which in turn had caused the cotton duties to be imposed. If the duties had been rendered necessary by useful expenditure for the safety of the Empire, or in developing the resources of India and trade, it would have been difficult to quarrel with such expenditure, but he could show that the deficit had been caused by extravagance in civil and military establishments. Vast sums had been spent in little wars beyond the frontier, wars of adventure and of aggression on our neighbours, and he held that such expenditure, instead of being necessary and beneficial, was purely mischievous. It was doing harm to our position, and endangering the safety of our Empire, because it was upsetting the good old traditional policy known as the policy of Lord Lawrence—the policy of keeping within our own bounds, cultivating friendly relations with our neighbours, keeping a full treasury, and producing contentment among the whole population of India. (Cheers.) The expenditure of which they complained showed no signs of decrease, nor even of being stationary. On the contrary, it was constantly increasing. In ten years it had gone up by no less a sum than twelve millions of tens of rupees. Even from a military point of view the policy which rendered such expenditure necessary appeared to be a mistake; for every general officer of experience who wrote to the newspapers in support of this policy four or five wrote to repudiate it. And from a political point of view, such a policy of aggression and restlessness in India was most dangerous and mischievous, because the want of consideration for the rights of our weaker neighbours naturally alarmed the Native States of India and made them suspicious of all our intentions. This policy was in that way undermining our position throughout India. Then there was the question of heavy taxation in India. He had observed that in all the schemes of Russian generals for the invasion of India the one great hope they had was that while the British army stood face to face with them along the frontier there might be a rising amongst the people of India against their oppressors. The real safety of our position in India was to make that impossible by having no fiscal oppression in India and by spending money on the useful development of the country. In that way the people of India, instead of being a danger, a sort of powder magazine behind us, would be as a tower of strength to defend us against all comers. He had spent a quarter of a century of his life in the service of the Government of India, and when he retired was Chief Secretary to the Government of Bombay in the political department. He could therefore claim to speak as an expert, and as one who had seen Indian affairs from the inside, and he was most firmly convinced, not only that the policy of aggression was not necessary, but that it was wholly mischievous, and he was prepared, therefore, to go with them heartily in any effort to get that great expenditure stopped in the interests of the millions both of this country and of India. (Cheers.)

Mr. **Dadabhai Naoroji**, M.P., who was received with cheers said he had not come there to quarrel with Lancashire, but to appeal to them as having their interests identical with those of India. He would first lay before them a few texts which would disclose the whole and true nature of the real condition of the Indian problem as it affects the true interests of the trade and industries of the British people. Macaulay said, as far back as 1833:—

"It would be on the most selfish view of the case far

> better for us that the people of India were well governed and independent of us, than ill-governed and subject to us, —that they were ruled by their own kings but wearing our broad-cloth and working with our cutlery than that they were performing their *salaams* to English collectors, and English magistrates, but were too ignorant to value or too poor to buy English manufactures. . . . . That would indeed be a doting wisdom which in order that India might remain a dependency. . . . would keep a hundred millions of men from being our customers in order that they might continue to be our slaves."

The second text he wished to give was a few words of Mr. Bright, from his speech of 1858 :—

> "We must in future have India governed, not for a handful of Englishmen, not for that Civil service whose praises are so constantly sounded in this House. . . . you may govern India if you like for the good of England, but the good of England must come through the channels of the good of India. . . . . There are but two modes of gaining anything by our connexion with India. The one is by plundering the people of India, and the other by trading with them. I prefer to do it by trading with them. But in order that England may become rich by trading with India, India itself must become rich."

The third text was a few words of Lord Salisbury in a minute :—

> "The injury is exaggerated in the case of India where so much of the revenue is exported without a direct equivalent. As India must be bled. . . ."

And lastly he would, as somewhat further explanation of the preceding texts, give a few words of Sir George Wingate, on Financial Relations with India :

> "With reference to its economic effects upon the condition of India. . . . taxes spent in the country from which they are raised are totally different in the effect from taxes raised in one country and spent in another. In the former case the taxes collected from the population. . . . are again returned to the industrious classes. . . . . But the case is wholly different when the taxes are not spent in the country from which they are raised. . . . . They constitute . . . . an absolute loss and extraction of the whole amount withdrawn from the taxed country . . . . might as well be thrown into the sea . . . . such is the nature of the tribute we have so long exacted from India. . . . . From this explanation some faint conception may be formed of the cruel crushing effect of the tribute upon India."

But (said Mr. Naoroji) even "in the former case" of taxes spent in India itself, a portion is consumed and enjoyed by an alien people, so that from the joint internal deprivation and external drain the people of India are afflicted with the triple evil of the loss of wealth, work, and wisdom. The Indian authorities, or Anglo-Indians, had kept up the policy, according to Macaulay, of making Indians slaves instead of customers; according to Bright, of plundering India instead of trading with it; according to Salisbury, of bleeding India; and, according to Wingate, of exacting a cruel, crushing tribute. The present system was simply the bleeding of India. To expect good trade with India as long as this policy was continued was simply ridiculous. There was a choice before the English people—whether India should remain in its present condition, impoverished and unable to buy English goods, or whether they would adopt a system by which India might become rich and by which England might become rich also. Here was a country, as Mr. Bright observed, of magnificent resources, and yet its people were miserably poor, and consequently not able to give us the trade that ought under fair circumstances to be ours. Under a wise policy the export trade of the produce of this country to India would be in excess of our total trade with all other parts of the world. The people of India were poor and lived poorly, not because they could not appreciate better things. Many of the Indian people were clothed in purple and gold when the natives of this island were wandering in their forests as savages. Their civilisation dated thousands of years before that of Britain. The people knew how to enjoy the good things of the world just as anyone in this country did. As matters now stood there was a constant bleeding of the country, and the end, it was to be feared, would be disaster. Lord Lawrence said the mass of the people lived on scanty substance, and the latest finance ministers declared the people to be extremely poor. Could there be a greater condemnation of the present system, that after a hundred years' rule of the most highly trumpeted and most exorbitantly paid Anglo-Indians the country was most miserably poor, and the blood of the destruction of millions and millions by famines lay upon our head? Our position in India depended not on our bayonets, but upon the contentment of the people. Bayonets might conquer an empire, but never would maintain one. It was only moral force, a sense of justice, satisfaction with the justice of British rule, that would enable us to keep our hold of India. If the people of India were wisely governed and freed from this constant drain on their resources they would become our best customers: our trade would increase to such an extent that we should be unable to supply the demands, and "unemployed" would be a word without meaning to us. (Hear, hear.) He appealed to the people of this country to consider these questions, to realise their gravity, and to devise a plan of better government. In that way by blessing the Indian people we should bless ourselves. (Cheers.) We were hankering after fresh markets, and killing negroes in thousands for that purpose; but if we would carry out a policy which would enable the people of India to buy our produce of an average of only £1 per head per annum, as compared with £7 or £8 in Australia, we should have a trade with India equal to that we had now with the whole world. (Applause.) At present the exports of British and Irish product to India was only 1s. 6d. or 2s. per head per annum of the population there, and a large portion of it was with the Native States, which had the administration of their own affairs. He asked them to say that the present system of administration must be thoroughly overhauled—(applause)—that they should cease to bleed Indians, and that instead of treating them as slaves, give them what was their birthright, the rights and privileges of British subjects—so repeatedly and so solemnly pledged to them for more than the past sixty years. (Applause.)

Mr. ARTHUR G. SYMONDS (Secretary of the National Reform Union) moved the following resolution :

> "That this meeting, being convinced that the imposition of cotton duties in India is mainly due to excessive and increasing military expenditure beyond the frontier, urges Lancashire representatives in Parliament to strictly scrutinise this expenditure, and to press upon the Government the maintenance of a frontier policy which will secure the safety of the Indian Empire while economising the resources and giving contentment to the people of India."

After pointing out that the arguments for the resolution had already been fully and admirably stated in the speeches of Mr. Stanhope, Sir Wm. Wedderburn, and Mr. Naoroji, Mr. Symonds said that the reason why he took so much interest in India and its good government—apart from sound political principles which he believed were held by all true Radicals—was that he was born in India, where his father had lived for over thirty years, and where he still had near relations living. His earliest memories were of India, and he could still recall the piteous sight of some poor little native children whom he remembered to have seen in one of the villages—tiny naked brown skeletons—on the verge of starvation, as so many of the natives of India always were. In the name of our common humanity and in the name of Christianity, he appealed to Lancashire men and women to take an active interest in the condition and good government of their fellow-subjects in India, and to realise the great and sacred responsibility which the possession of that great dependency imposed on the people of this country. (Cheers.)

Mr. GORDON HEWART, who seconded the resolution, said that he had been invited to speak as a native of Lancashire, but the theory of some Anglo-Indian authorities appeared to be that no Lancashire man could possibly know anything of Indian affairs. Their theory was that the people of Lancashire, like the taxpayer in India, should pay the piper while a clique of officials called the tune. (Laughter.) That was not the view of the present audience. It was not the view of the gentlemen whose speeches they had just heard. It was not the view of the illustrious statesman whose statue stood not many yards away from that hall. Mr. John Bright said of India: "What you want is a new and a wiser and a broader policy, and that policy, I much fear, you will never have from the Government of Calcutta, until the people of England say that it is their policy and must be adopted." The purpose of that meeting, as he understood it, was to carry the case of the Indian taxpayer to the court of appeal—from the decision of servants who claimed the authority of masters to the tribunal of the electorate. He hoped that the meeting would prove to be the predecessor of many similar meetings, and that their effect would be to arouse, not only in that county but throughout the country, a sympathetic and abiding interest in the affairs of their Indian fellow-subjects. (Cheers.)

The customary votes of thanks concluded the proceedings.

The *Manchester Guardian* wrote on May 2nd:—The National Reform Union chose its time well for the meeting which was held yesterday in Manchester to discuss the civil and military expenditure of India. It is almost hopeless in ordinary times to try to interest large masses of Englishmen in Indian affairs. But two recent events have fixed the eyes of Lancashire people, at any rate, on that country. The Chitral adventure has struck everybody's imagination, and the re-imposition of the cotton duties has made Lancashire fear for part of her trade. These two events, closely connected, are an admirable starting-point for the inquiries which Sir William Wedderburn and Mr. Naoroji last night asked their hearers to make for themselves. How comes it that cotton duties are required at all? In the first place, because—apart from the perennial currency difficulty—the Indian Government has adopted the policy of which the Chitral imbroglio was a typical result. The relief of Chitral, it is estimated, will cost India two millions sterling. And it is not an isolated piece of expenditure of the kind. Nearly thirty millions, unless we are mistaken, have been spent in the last fifteen years in carrying out the frontier policy of which the establishment of the Chitral agency was a part. That is to say, two millions a year, or the price of a serious border war, are regularly spent in changing the North-West Frontier. Now it might be wise for the English public which does not know India at first hand to acquiesce in this policy if it were unanimously approved by those who do know India well, and if these experts came forward as one man, or even if a large majority of them came forward, to tell us that the abandonment of this policy would threaten the security and prosperity of India, and that her Government could not lessen this terrible expenditure without exposing her to the risk of future losses more serious than the burden of the present expenditure itself. But there is no such unanimity. For every Anglo-Indian expert who publicly defends the "forward" policy another Anglo-Indian expert of equal competence comes forward to show that it is not only useless and burdensome but positively dangerous even from the point of view of Indian defence against possible Russian aggression. This is not a case in which English popular intervention would be a presumptuous setting up of the lay judgment against the judgment of experts. It is a case on which the experts have failed to agree, which they are all busily laying before the neutral public at home, and which it is the duty of the public to investigate and to decide.

The question put as simply as we can put it is this. It is assumed that Russia might at some future time wish to attack India on her North-West frontier. She is now separated from it by a vast tract of mountain and desert. It seems as if Nature had tasked her kindness and ingenuity to mark out our frontier with a great river bordered on our side of it by rich and easily traversed land, where communications are rapid, supplies plentiful, and administration almost positively remunerative, while the country beyond the river is in the main utterly barren, half covered with waterless deserts, and seamed and scarred with mountains, mountain torrents, and pestilential swamps. It was the feeling of Lawrence and till lately it was the feeling of all the greatest authorities on Indian defence, that India could have no surer protection than this that Nature had arranged. It seemed to them that we had simply to sit in readiness with our armies on the banks of the Indus, at Sukkur, at Mooltan, and at Rawal Pindi, and wait for such remnants of a hostile army as might dribble slowly out of the mountain defiles across the river after months of famine and dysentery and guerilla warfare with the tribes on their long route. This was Lawrence's policy. He felt that the further we went to meet Russia across the intervening desert the more would we decrease the difficulties of her own advance, lessening the distance over which she would have to march her armies to meet us, and increasing the distance between our own troops and their true base of operations. "I am convinced," he said in 1867, "that we can gain nothing, but are pretty sure to lose a great deal in prestige, in honour, in the valuable lives of our officers and soldiers by interfering actively in the affairs of Central Asia; and that, so far from strengthening our tenure of India, we may thus shake it to its very foundations. Nor am I insensible, I admit, to the financial aspects of the question. I know well what are the wants of India; how infinite are the material requirements of this country; how limited is the accumulation of capital; how obnoxious is every description of taxation to all classes of the people." The last consideration is not merely a consideration of compassion for the Indian taxpayer. It is all-important from the point of view of military defence. For if ever Russia should dream of attacking India with an army which, she must know, would be decimated by the hardships of the approach, it would be with the hope that the presence of even such an army would raise native India in revolt against the British Government. The spectacle of a contented India would put such hopes out of the question. And India can only be contented when she is not unduly taxed. Every annual contribution of two million sterling by the population of India to the cost of little wars and expeditions beyond her frontier weakens the fund of goodwill and loyalty on which our defence would rest even more surely than on a scientific frontier in the case of a foreign attack. So that by this policy of frontier extension we certainly weaken the Indian Empire in one respect, and we probably weaken it in every other. Our moral hold on the country is weakened; our physical wall of defence is, in the opinion of half the best authorities, broken down. In late years this policy has had the upper hand. We spent two and a quarter millions to occupy Quetta, a step which Lawrence declared "unnecessary and impolitic" when it was proposed to him. Every year now, in spite of the protests of soldiers like Sir Neville Chamberlain, we are spending almost as much in fresh advances which are gradually covering with military roads, telegraphs and depôts of supplies the waste in which an invading army would have been starved and worn to pieces if it had attempted to cross it when we had left it unreclaimed.

One falls almost insensibly into the way of saying that "we" are spending this money—one hears so often in this country heroic protestations that whatever may happen "we" must defend India to "our" last shilling, and the like. The only shillings that we ever spent or are likely to spend on the defence of India were in the exceptional contribution of £5,000,000 which Mr. Gladstone made from British taxes towards the expenses of the last Afghan war. As a rule, India pays, and will continue to pay, for every breach of the Lawrence policy which is committed by her Government. Not only that, but she pays, under the head of "Home Charges," a heavy contribution towards the expenses of the army at home. Under the present system the whole cost of the home depôts of British regiments serving in India—and these constitute no small part of the garrisons in Great Britain and Ireland—are charged on the Indian revenues. As Lord Northbrook said, "every single farthing of the British soldier's expenses from the time he recruits until the time he goes out is paid by India." Where a soldier's period of service is partly devoted to the defence of this country and partly to the defence of India, India pays for the whole. The same spirit is shown in the arrangements for the maintenance of the India Office in London. We did not venture to ask the Colonies to build the Colonial Office or to pay the annual charges of its establishment. But we built the India Office, at six times as great a cost out of Indian revenues, and every penny of its annual cost comes from the same purse. It is only a small item among many large ones; but, as an example of the practice of laying on the Indian Budget every possible charge that can be shifted from our own shoulders, it may be mentioned that when the Ministry of the day wished to give the Sultan of Turkey an imposing reception in London, the India Office then just completed, was used for the purpose, and the bill of £10,000 for the expenses of the party was sent in to the taxpayers of India.

ANGLO-INDIANS AND THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., has appended to his minute of dissent from the report of the majority of his colleagues on the opium traffic the following Memorandum on the attitude of the authorities in India:—

1. While in India I was obliged to express dis-

approval of the action of the Government of India and of various officials in relation to the Commission. As the after proceedings did not remove but strengthened this objection, it is due to the Commission and myself to place the main grounds of this objection on record.

In doing so I readily acknowledge the difficult position of the Indian authorities. Rightly or wrongly, they appeared to hold in the main that the good government of India is bound up with the opium revenue. The difficulties arose from assuming an impartiality on the part of the Indian authorities which could not be, and was not, continuously enforced.

2. Some of the circumstances to which I am about to refer were stated in a letter addressed by me to Lord Brassey while we were in India, but the consideration given to them appeared to me inadequate. I have here omitted some and added others.

3. On the 18th November, 1893, it transpired that a telegram had been sent from the Government of India to the Secretary of State on the 15th August, containing the following passage: "We shall be prepared to suggest non-official witnesses, who will give independent evidence, but we cannot undertake to specially search for witnesses who will give evidence against opium. We presume this will be done by the Anti-Opium Society." As anti-opium evidence was easily available, without any special search, this official statement seemed to show that the authorities were taking up a partisan attitude.

4. Two days later a letter from Lord Lansdowne, then Viceroy of India, to Lord Brassey, Chairman of the Commission, was passed round to the members for perusal. It contained a statement in favour of the existing opium system, and against interference with that system as likely to lead to serious trouble. This appeared to me a departure from the judicial attitude which might have been expected from Her Majesty's Representative.

5. The Government of Madras was not allowed to present its own case to the Commission, but was instructed by the Government of India (13th December, 1893,) to send to Calcutta abstracts of evidence of proposed witnesses. A letter of similar purport was addressed on the same day to the Resident at Haidarabad with regard to the evidence of other witnesses. Similar instructions were given to the Government of the North-West Provinces. I submit that this requirement was distinctly detrimental to the free expression of opinion and unprecedented in the history of Royal Commissions.

6. An official letter was sent (30th December, 1893) from the Government of the North-West Provinces and Oudh, to all Commissioners of Divisions, and other officials in these provinces, calling attention to the fact that some officials had "communicated direct with the Secretary of the Commission, submitting to that officer abstracts of the evidence," and pointing out "that there is no authority for this procedure, and . . . . that all communications should be addressed to this Government." Here, again, the authorities seemed determined that no evidence should be submitted to the Commission which had not been subjected to official scrutiny in high quarters. Moreover, this circular was not communicated to officials alone, but even to non-official persons who were intending, and were considered qualified, to give evidence on the subject of the inquiry.

7. At Benares, Mr. Isan Chandra Roy, M.B., stated that he had been officially invited to be a witness and to furnish an abstract of his intended evidence. After he forwarded his statement, he was informed by official letter, in which no reason was assigned, that his evidence was not required. The fact that he entertained anti-opium opinions was subsequently proved by his volunteered evidence before the Commission. Other proposed witnesses at Benares were similarly treated.

8. At Bankipur, a list of witnesses intended to be called on the 3rd January was supplied to me. It included the name of Rai Bahadur Jai Prakash Lal, C.I.E., Dewan of Dumraon. This gentleman represents a large estate in which poppy is extensively cultivated. He was not called. Information from two sources led me to believe that his evidence would not have been altogether favourable to the Government. The official version of this circumstance will be found in Vol. V., p. 355, paragraphs 4 to 10, and as I have commented on it in the Appendix to my dissent from the Report of the majority of the Commission, I will only add a strong expression of my opinion that as the Dewan was not called on the 3rd January, the Commission ought to have been informed that he was present on the 6th January. The withholding of that information was not creditable to those concerned.

9. At Lucknow twenty-four witnesses were called at the instance of the Government, twenty-three of whom gave evidence generally favourable to the Government case. Thinking that a different kind of evidence might have been omitted, Mr. R. M. Dane, who accompanied the Commission to manage the case on behalf of the Government of India, was, at my request, asked by Lord Brassey to put in the list of persons who had been asked by the authorities to give evidence at Lucknow, together with such abstracts of their evidence as had not already been produced. I thought the Commission was entitled to know the method that had been followed in making the selection of witnesses, and that the original list of witnesses, with the marks and notes upon it, would throw light on the subject. The list was not produced. It was stated that the names of Lucknow witnesses were included in the general list of all the witnesses for the North-West Provinces and Oudh; but that circumstance seems quite irrelevant, and an altogether insufficient reason. However, the names of seventeen rejected witnesses extracted from the list were supplied, together with the abstracts of evidence of sixteen, four of whom seem to entertain anti-opium views, and four others make some strong observations against the use of opium. I would draw particular attention to the fact that two of these gentlemen, namely, Mr. P. Wyndham, C.S., Assistant Commissioner and Excise Officer, Sultánpur, and Mirza Muhammad Beg, Deputy Collector of Basti, make the important statement that in their opinion revenue and rents derived from land would not be sensibly affected by the prohibition of poppy cultivation.

10. At Bombay another instance of the anxiety of the authorities to prevent the free communication of information on the opium question was brought to light by the Rev. A. W. Prautch. An official circular had been issued desiring that information applied for by Mr. Ernest Hart, Chairman of the British Medical Association, should not be replied to, on the ground that "to reply to such applications might prove embarrassing."

11. I learned at Bankipur that the police at Gaya had been searching out the movements of two of my friends and myself for the purpose of ascertaining with what persons we had had communication. As this matter formed the subject of protest on my part before the Commission, I need only refer to the Minutes of Evidence. I do not know whether on any other occasion we were similarly tracked.

12. Perhaps the most notable instance of the Government method of preparing for the fair and honest inquiry expected in England will be found in the correspondence relating to the Native States of Rajputana. On the 9th September, 1893, the Government of India directed the agent of the Governor-General in Rajputana to invite the durbars of the Native States to appoint witnesses to give evidence before the Commission, and also to nominate a British officer to give evidence as to those States. An abstract of his evidence was, as in other cases, to be forwarded to the Government of India. Accordingly, on the 22nd September the agent, Colonel G. H. Trevor, sent out a circular "to all political officers in Rajputana," desiring that the durbars [courts] of the Native States should be invited to nominate witnesses, and requesting the British officers addressed to furnish information and statistics. On the 5th October Lieut.-Colonel Abbott was appointed to give evidence himself, as well as to produce the witnesses, and arrange the evidence from the Native States—the request for a draft of his evidence being again repeated by the Government of India. Colonel Abbott then prepared a note on opium, which will repay careful perusal. He indicated the principal heads of evidence, and, among other things, suggested "that some stalwart Sondhia, Mewati, and Rajput lumberdars and patels should be among the witnesses selected." He made numerous other suggestions as to matters of detail entirely in favour of the existing state of things, and without any provision for ascertaining and proving any matters of an adverse character, either of fact or of opinion. He advised that the witnesses "should reach Ajmere a week in advance" of the Commission, and supplied the reason, namely, "that I may become acquainted with all, and see if each one understands on what points he is required to give evidence." He also made careful suggestions for preparing ample claims for compensation. On the 29th November "all political officers" were again addressed on the subject as follows: "Mr. R. M. Dane, C.S., the officer selected by the Government of India to advise local administrations in the matter of preparing for the inquiry to be held by the Opium Commission, has had an opportunity of seeing the previous correspondence on that subject in this office, and has pointed out that the great importance of the inquiry . . . . has apparently not been fully appreciated . . . . that Rajputana is vitally interested in the inquiry," and that "there should be no lack of evidence, both official and non-official, to prove before the Commission the full extent of their rights and interests in opium." The suggestion was repeated that witnesses were, if practicable, to be "ready in Ajmere about a week in advance of the Commission's arrival there." Taken altogether, this correspondence is, in my opinion, as one-sided as the instructions in a brief in a partisan cause, and the evidence, which in accordance with these suggestions, was prepared and put before the Commission at Ajmere, was of an unusually partial and one-sided character.

13. The instances I have given as to the action of the authorities appear to me inconsistent with any real desire on their part that the whole of the facts should come in a perfectly unbiassed manner before the world. Whatever the Government of India intended by their determination not to seek for evidence of an anti-opium character, its action was likely to be understood, and was undoubtedly understood, to mean that pro-opium evidence was to be sought for, and anti-opium evidence was not.

14. Lord Brassey himself had early recognised the true position of the Government, as is clear from his statement to Mr. Alexander, the secretary of the Anti-Opium Society, at the close of his evidence before the Commission: "We all appreciate that in the encounter in which you are engaged with the Government of India upon its own ground you are placed in circumstances of no ordinary difficulty."

15. My contention on this subject is, that having regard to the nature of British authority in India and to the moral timidity of many residents in India, both Native and European, it was the duty of the Government, in the presentation of evidence to be adduced before the Commission, to have publicly assured the people generally that no harm would come to them by giving free expression to their views, however opposed such views might be to the interests of the revenue, or the known predilection of English officials. In fact, it should have given practical effect to Mr. Westland's message read by the chairman at the commencement of the proceedings on the 27th December: "The Government, however, will not reply to such evidence [that is anti-opium evidence] as a defendant, but will merely pursue their course of enabling the Commission to fully ascertain the actual facts."

16. In view of the various incidents which came to my knowledge, and some of which are here set forth, I am driven to the conclusion that the authorities in India have not pursued their declared "course of enabling the Commission to fully ascertain the actual facts."

Reviews.

INDIAN SCENES.

Among the Gods. Scenes of India: with Legends by the Way. By Augusta Klein. (William Blackwood and Son. 1895.)

This is a very pleasantly written account of a journey through India, occupying the months from

November, 1891, to the spring of the following year. The same travellers have already been introduced to the public, for their doings in Palestine were chronicled in the pages of *Blackwood's Magazine*. "There is Irene, the tender-hearted, Philippa the business-like, and Sebaste, who gathers much wool in the course of every day." The trio play their parts throughout the book. The scraps of exact information are offered by Philippa. Sebaste, the scribe, is prone to somewhat metaphysical vagaries. Irene acts the part of an amiable background. They touched first at Ceylon, and spent some days there. At that season of the year Ceylon presents its most delightful aspect. "Truly it is an alluring land, an enchanted island just risen in freshness and beauty from the depths of the shining sea." Here, as elsewhere, in their travels, they are chiefly interested in the temples, and Ceylon recalls many Buddhist legends which are touched upon. At the approach of Christmas they crossed to Southern India, hoping to spend Christmas Day at the mission station of Nazareth. But they were unable to reach this point till a few days later. Some particulars are given of the work done by the missions in Southern India, so far as these are carried on by the Anglican Church. Most interesting, perhaps, is this mission at Nazareth, where educational and medical work supplements more strictly evangelical undertakings. At Trichinopoli the Principal of the College gave, among other details, an amusing story descriptive of the plays which are frequently acted by the students.

> "With regard to costume, the students have the most original ideas; chiefly they are convinced of the necessity (for whatsoever character) of a modern English suit, a walking stick, and a pair of well blacked English boots. We had 'King John,' which went off very well indeed, except for a somewhat disconcerting catastrophe at the beginning of the fourth act. Hubert and his attendant villains had never worn boots before. The consequence was that when they simultaneously rushed on the stage (each flourishing his inevitable walking-stick) they all three suddenly tumbled down together."

Here the travellers visit also the great pagoda, which is dedicated to Krishna the Preserver. This is the largest pagoda in India, covering more than 163 acres, and containing among other things the Hall of the Thousand Columns. Their visit to Madras calls forth the legend concerning the martyrdom of S. Thomas, the saint whose name is connected by history, and far more closely by tradition, with the earliest attempts to Christianise India. Through Calcutta, which scarcely gets its share of attention, the travellers pass on to the magnificent mountain scenery of Darjiling. Afterwards they come to the holy city of Benares and the sacred waters of the Ganges.

> "All the religious energy of Benares has for its heart and its centre the bank of the Ganges. Thither move for ever processions innumerable. Sometimes it is a wedding train; sometimes a moaning chant fills the air as the funeral of some pious Hindu creeps onward to the burning ghat, whence the ashes of the departed will be carried away by the holy waters, and his soul fly straight to a fabled heaven."

Among the many other places described are the Pool of Immortality and the Golden Temple at Amritsar. There is a short account of Nanak, the founder of the Sikh religion, and of the Gurus who followed him. The aim of the book is merely to offer a description of the various parts of India. Hindu mythology is far too complicated a matter to be more than touched upon in what does not profess to be a learned treatise. But the stories from the Mahabharata and other books of the East are well chosen, and add much to the attractiveness of the volume. It contains also twenty-two full page illustrations, which are excellent reproductions of photographs.

"CHIPS," LINGUISTIC AND LITERARY.

Chips from a German Workshop. By F. MAX MULLER, K.M., Foreign Member of the French Institute. New Edition. Vol. III.: Essays on Language and Literature. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co.)

In this third bundle of "Chips," Professor Max Müller gives three parts to Language and two parts to Literature, the literature being mainly German, with dashes of French and English. If the fine essay on Schiller, which stands first, had been placed with the other literary sketches, the two departments would have been completely separated, each compact. Practically, however, this matters nothing at all. Those of us who take a genuine interest in the subjects discussed will find no difficulty in laying their hand on any particular "chip" when they may want it.

There is a certain homogeneity in the main part at least of the linguistic essays in the present volume. The Rede Lecture of 1868 at Cambridge is devoted to an exposition of the Stratification of Language. The Rede Lecture of 1875 deals with the Chronology of Language. The inaugural lecture which the author delivered as Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford appraises the value of that subject as a branch of academic study. The inaugural lecture he delivered before the Imperial University of Strassburg in 1872 estimates the results of the science of Language. These four lectures together represent concisely the drift of the author's general views on the main aspects of linguistic study. There is much interest also in a number of special notes appended to the Oxford and Strassburg lectures, discussing particular points of importance, mainly grammatical. A short paper on "Spelling Reform in France," dated 1893, is supplementary to a general article on "Spelling," dated 1876.

The Professor always sets forth his views in luminous language and skilfully marshals his illustrations to enforce them. There is an air of ease and polish that implies mastery and confidence. However it might be wished that passages should be rewritten here and there from a later standpoint, still the Professor does not find any essential necessity for modification in the main lines of his contention. The reason is to be found, less in lack of openness of mind, chiefly in the thoroughness of of his work before he gave the results to the scholarly public. As the linguistic essays stand, they are striking landmarks in the progress of a great study, indicating, among other things, the driving force applied by the author himself. It seems strange that so lately as 1868 Professor Max Müller should have been setting before him, as the chief object of the lecture on the Stratification of Language, "to call attention to a fact that had not been noticed before, namely, that there is hardly any language which is not at the same time isolating, combinatory, and inflectional." It is pleasant to watch with what friendly courtesy he breaks a lance with Professor Curtius over the attempt of the latter "to establish seven distinct chronological periods in the history of the Aryan speech previous to its separation into Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Slavonic, Teutonic, and Celtic." It is inspiring to note with what lofty and steady confidence he maintains the value and assesses the results of his favourite science. On occasion, too, Professor Max Müller can be wisely and suggestively discursive; as where he points out the easy reforms that would open up a career in England for scholars and students—reforms that have been more or less nibbled at in recent years—or where he illustrates the observation that he knows of "no life more perfect than that of a German professor in a German school or university." Through every scientific lesson is felt the pulsation of a large human heart as well as the light of a penetrating mind.

There is much wider scope for the expression of moral judgments and varied feeling in the essays on Literature. We have already referred to the sketch of the "Life of Schiller." A mere sketch it is, no doubt; but Professor Max Müller takes care to select for comment just those influences that determined the direction of the poet's genius at different periods of his career. Now and again, too, we find a large generalisation worthy to be treasured. Thus: "The lives of great men are the lives of martyrs; we cannot regard them as examples to follow, but rather as types of human excellence to study and admire." Again: "Schiller was too great a man to be ambitious." Professor Max Müller told his compatriots in the Strassburg lecture that though he had lived long abroad and pitched his tent for nearly twenty-five years—it is nearly twenty-five years more since 1872—on English soil, yet he had always remained German in heart and mind. Almost necessarily so; and no sensible man will quarrel with the fact or the statement. And cogent evidence will be seen throughout these essays, for the Professor rises to his highest enthusiasm in contemplation of the master works in the literature of the Fatherland. With this feeling it is easy for us to sympathise. For, as he himself remarks epigrammatically, "there is no country where so much interest is taken in the literature of Germany as in England, and there is no country where the literature of England is so much appreciated as in Germany." His article on "German Literature," together with the chronological collection of extracts from the fourth to the nineteenth century to which it was originally prefixed, undoubtedly aided the tendency of English students to study German literature before the times of Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe—in consonance with the similar tendency towards the ancient treasures of English literature. We have advanced a considerable distance in these studies since that essay was written; but though we have altered the facts somewhat, the spirit of the essay has not yet spent its influence, and the lucid and judicious survey will richly repay a careful reading. It is to be noted, too, that Professor Max Müller keeps well in view the whole mental life of the nation, for his "German Classics," as he points out in his rapid survey of German Literature, "if properly used, can be read as a running commentary on the political and social history of Germany." How keenly sympathetic is the essay on the old Minnesänger, who sang of Faith, Love, and Honour!

> "We are awed by the presence of those tall and silent knights, with their hands folded and their legs crossed, as we see them reposing in full armour on the tombs of our cathedrals. And yet, however different in all other respects, these men, if they once lift their steel bearer and unbuckle their rich armour, are wonderfully like ourselves. Let us read the poetry, which they either wrote themselves, to which they liked to listen in their castles on the Rhine or under their tents in Palestine, and we find it is poetry which a Tennyson or a Moore, a Goethe or a Heine, might have written. . . . . It is modern poetry—poetry unknown to the ancient world, and who invented it nobody can tell. It is sometimes called romantic, but this is a strange misnomer. . . . It is Teutonic poetry—purely Teutonic in its heart and soul, thought its utterance, its rhyme and metre, its grace and imagery, show the marks of a warmer clime. It is called sentimental poetry. . . . . It is subjective as distinguished from objective poetry. . . . . It is Gothic, as contrasted with classical poetry. . . . . But all these are but names, and their true meaning must be discovered in the works of art themselves, and in the history of the times which produced the artists, the poets, and their ideals. . . . . Most of the poems of the Minnesänger are sad rather than joyful—joyful in sorrow, sorrowful in joy. . . . . There is simplicity about these old songs, a want of effort, an entire absence of any attempt to please or to surprise and we listen to them as we listen to a friend who tells us his suffering in broken and homely words, and whose truthful prose appeals to our heart more strongly than the most elaborate poetry of a Lamartine or a Heine."

The essay on Sebastian Brant's famous "Narrenschiff," or "Ye Schippe of Fooles," is well worth permanent record; and the paper on "The Language and Poetry of Schleswig-Holstein" formed a very interesting addition to English knowledge of that country at the date of the troubles over the Schleswig-Holstein question, and is of permanent value. The Professor illustrates by charming examples the exception made by Klaus Groth to the still further exceptionable proverb, "Holstein singt nicht." The essay concludes with a most touching and simply heroic episode of the luckless Danish War of 1863. There is much that is curious and suggestive in the papers on "Joinville," "The 'Journal des Savants,' and the 'Journal de Trévoux'," "Chasot," and "A German Traveller in England, A.D. 1568" (Paul Hentzner). There is also a worthy tribute to "Shakespeare," delivered at the Tercentenary proceedings at Stratford-on-Avon in 1864 by Professor Max Müller as the representative of Frankfort, the birth-place of Goethe. The final essay, on "Bacon in Germany," summarises the argument of the well-known volume of the distinguished Professor Kuno Fischer. The third volume of the new edition of "Chips" is thus seen to be full of important and suggestive matter, ably and charmingly presented.

Printed by A. BONNER, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.

FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 7.] (NEW SERIES.)] JULY, 1895. [SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus" .. 193
Sir J. Westland's Budget 198
Results in Waziristan 199
Mr. Fowler at the India Office 200
The Bhousla Fund 201
OUR LONDON LETTER 202
British Rule in India: Interview with Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee 203
Empire of India Exhibition. I. 205
Schools for Married Indian Girls 207
Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure 208
PAGE.
DEMOCRACY AND IMPERIALISM, by A. E. Fletcher .. 209
CHITRAL AND KABUL, by J. Dacosta 211
THE INDIA OF THE VEDA, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D. 213
The Indian Parliamentary Committee and the Indian Budget 215
Chitral and the "Forward" Policy 216
REVIEWS: Mirza Haidar's History 220
Wellesley 222
Anglo-Urdu Medical Handbook 224
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects .. 224

Indiana.

The defeat of the Government in the House of Commons on June 21st may have important and far-reaching effects in Indian affairs. At the time of writing, Mr. Fowler, in common with his colleagues, has resigned office, although he and they continue to act as ministers until the appointment of their successors. The people of India will rejoice to learn that the retiring Government has, in the words of the *Daily News*, "been able to place to its credit a resolution to abandon Chitral." Whoever may be Mr. Fowler's successor—whether Lord Lansdowne, Mr. G. N. Curzon, or another—he will hardly dare to ignore this resolution, and to permit the advocates of the "forward" policy to play fast and loose with the finances of India. Mr. Fowler's decision, which comes better late than never, is in accordance with the explicit undertakings of the Viceroy in his proclamation against Umra Khan, and it will perhaps serve to cover a multitude of shortcomings in Mr. Fowler's record at the India Office. It is worth noting that the *Times*, in its issue of June 24th, wrote that Mr. Fowler

> "is perhaps happy in the occasion of his political death, as we fear he contemplated a fatal surrender in the matter of Chitral."

There is obviously no doubt as to Mr. Fowler's intentions, backed as they are by the weight of expert opinion. In these circumstances, his successor will incur a very grave responsibility if he reverses the policy now laid down.

"All's well that ends well." During the past month frequent attempts were made, by means of questions put in the House of Commons, to obtain information as to the Government's intentions or, failing that, an opportunity of public discussion. But these questions were for the most part met with evasive answers. Indeed, when Sir W. Wedderburn asked Sir W. Harcourt whether, before taking action, the Government would afford the House of Commons an opportunity of expressing its opinions on the subject of Chitral, Sir W. Harcourt replied, in effect, that no communication would be made to the House of Commons until the Government had determined its policy. The incident illustrated anew some of the perils with which representative institutions are threatened by distant empire. Meantime, the advocates of occupation, official and non-official, have not been idle. The *Times*, in particular, has carried on an eager and persistent campaign on behalf of the "forward" policy—a campaign in which suppression or delay of communications *per contra* have been minor, though instructive, incidents. There have, it is true, been two voices from Simla speaking in the columns of the *Times*. If we were assured one day that the Government of India had advised the occupation of Chitral and the construction of a road thither, we heard a few days later that the Government had, after all, resolved to withdraw. These discrepancies may have indicated only the uncertainty of the writer, or, as is probable, the later message may have been intended to arouse the advocates of the "forward" policy to greater activity in Whitehall and Printing-house Square. Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, as will be seen from the account of an "interview" which is printed elsewhere, was inclined to take a despondent view and to believe that not only the present act, but future acts of aggression also, would be sanctioned by the Imperial Government. But perhaps Mr. Bonnerjee is disposed, as he may well be, to underrate the strength of the forces in the United Kingdom which, appearances to the contrary notwithstanding, still make for "peace, retrenchment and reform."

It is, however, highly disappointing that Liberal newspapers in the United Kingdom have paid so little attention to so signal a departure from Liberal policy as that which was threatened. There are, it is true, some honourable exceptions. The *Manchester Guardian*, for example, whose influence is second to that of no Liberal journal in the country, has in a series of admirable articles deprecated the policy of occupation, and for Mr. Fowler's daring to be wise the *Manchester Guardian* deserves much of the credit. The *Spectator* also, whose well known Anglo-Indian adviser has taken the right line, has done good service. Passages from these journals are reproduced on another page. But what had become of the vigour of the *Daily Chronicle*, and why was the *Daily News* so silent? It is to be feared that wrong-headed ideas of Imperial expansion have, especially under Lord Rosebery's ill-starred leadership, found their way into the Liberal party, while the Government's lease of life in the House of Commons was of so precarious a tenure that forty righteous Liberals could not be found who would move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to this matter of urgent importance. These circumstances, however, only increased Mr. Fowler's responsibility as they added to his power. If he had decided in favour of occupation his decision would have been contrary to the opinions of the majority, and the best, of the experts, whether military or financial. Even Sir Lepel Griffin has joined with General Sir Neville Chamberlain, General Lord Chelmsford, General Sir John Adye, General Sir Charles Gough, Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir David Barbour in opposing a policy which, while it offers no advantage whatever, is already responsible for the financial embarrassments of the Government of India.

The terms of reference to the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure are, as they appear in the *London Gazette*, slightly different from the original announcement. The later version is as follows:

> "To enquire into the administration and management of the military and civil expenditure incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council, or of the Government of India, and the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India for purposes in which both are interested."

The Commission meets for the first time on Wednesday, June 26th, at the India Office, and one of the most important questions which it will then be called upon to decide is whether or not its proceedings shall be conducted with closed doors. A rumour was current some time ago that Mr. Fowler had decided to exclude the press. Mr. Seymour Keay put a question on this all-important matter in the House of Commons on June 20th. The reply was that no decision had yet been taken, and that the matter rested with the Commissioners themselves. It is almost inconceivable that the Commission, packed though it is with officials, will deliberately fly in the face of precedent and resolve itself into a hole-and-corner enquiry. Already the terms of reference have been so contrived, and the *personnel* of the Commission has been so arranged, as to give the minimum of opportunity to the advocates of retrenchment. Their last hope will be gone if representatives of the newspapers are to be excluded from the sittings of the Commission. I anticipate no such result; but if so untoward a decision should be taken, it would probably become a question for the representatives of the Indian people whether they could continue to serve on the Commission at all and, by their presence, lend their approval to a secret enquiry conducted by officials for officials.

On the assumption that the sittings of the Royal Commission are held, as they ought to be held, in public, the first business of the non-official members will be to direct its enquiries into the most useful channel. Human nature is much the same on Royal Commissions as elsewhere, and it is likely that the first definite suggestions which are offered as to procedure will be gratefully accepted. If this belief be well-grounded, it would be well for the non-official members to draw up, say, a series of questions for immediate investigation and to lay the document, with some adequate evidence, before their colleagues at the first meeting. Otherwise there is a danger that the officials may, from the first, get the enquiry very much under their own control and keep it there. In that case it would be rash to expect that any great advantage would accrue to the taxpayers of India from the recommendations of the Commission. It must also be borne in mind that, however vehemently Mr. Fowler in speeches delivered in the House of Commons may have deprecated any enquiry into policy, the deliberations of the Commission are limited not by Mr. Fowler's desires but only by the terms of reference. Now, the terms of reference speak of the "administration" and "management" of Indian expenditure. What is administration?

What is management? What is the difference between the two? How much is capable of inclusion under the correlative terms, maladministration and mismanagement? Here, I cannot help thinking, is some opportunity not indeed for any discussion of high Imperial policy but for close scrutiny of the financial prudence of particular schemes which the Government of India has from to time approved as means to particular ends.

Moreover, enquiry into the administration and management of expenditure can hardly be complete if it ignores the preliminary question whether any part of the expenditure has been illegal. Hence the Commission may well find itself called upon to examine what it is precisely that is Indian expenditure—whether, for example, in aggressive operations and the occupation or absorption of territories beyond the frontier, the Government of India has at any time transgressed the statutory regulations which determine its power. The fate of the Opium Commission, also, should put members of Lord Welby's Commission on their guard. There must be no official revision, selection, or filtration of evidence, and care must be taken that those persons are called who are really able to tender the most useful evidence. Finally, there is a danger that the deliberations of the Commission may cover so wide a field that the issue of a report may be long delayed, or even rendered impossible. A suggestion has been made, and it is worth repeating, that *interim* reports might conveniently be issued upon the various organic sections of the subject-matter.

An instructive light is thrown upon the various uses to which the accounts of the Government of India can be put by a recent controversy between Sir Auckland Colvin, an ex-Finance Minister, and Sir Henry Waterfield, Secretary in the Financial Department of the India Office. In the debate on the Opium Commission, Mr. Fowler said that in 1887, excluding loss by exchange, Indian army expenditure amounted to nineteen millions and was considerably under twenty millions in 1893.

> "Apart from the exchange," he added, "there has been no great increase in the army expenditure in India for a number of years. The real increase of expenditure lay in Exchange . . . . it does not lie in increased military expenditure."

This is, as everybody knows, the orthodox official theory. But it has not the advantage of being supported by facts. Sir Auckland Colvin at once pointed out that, according to the Parliamentary Return dated, June 8, 1894, the Indian Army Expenditure, *minus* Exchange, was £18,845,923 in 1887-88; £20,477,885 in 1892-93; and £20,382,528 in 1893-94. The increase which these figures show since 1887 is £1,536,705. But this figure is illusory. For the figures for 1887-88 include £1,475,300 on account of the pacification of Upper Burma besides other "exceptional payments." What we are concerned with is, as Sir Auckland Colvin said, the scale of normal Army Expenditure. Omitting, therefore, "exceptional payments" and loss by exchange one finds that the figures are £17,352,304 in 1887-88 as compared with £19,882,628 in 1893-94. In other words, apart from exchange and apart from the cost of military defence works and strategic railways, the increase in Army Expenditure from 1887 to 1893 was about two and a-half millions. Yet Mr. Fowler speaks of "no great increase." So much for the expenditure; but what of the exchange, upon which the officials rely? In 1887-88 the charge for exchange on the military expenditure was £1,572,011. In 1893 it was £2,870,969—an increase of a little over a million and a quarter. It is, then, this million and a quarter which accounts for the "real increase," and not the two millions and a-half disclosed above? It is the one-third and not the two-thirds which makes the difference? Yet there was a time when Mr. Fowler used to criticise Mr. Goschen's surpluses.

Of course Sir Henry Waterfield, as in duty bound, rushed to Mr. Fowler's rescue. But what was his excuse? It was characteristic: "The figures are taken from different returns, compiled in a different manner." The sentence recalls Mr. A. J. Wilson's emphatic and well-grounded condemnation, in our last number, of the modes in which India accounts are presented. Whatever may be the intentions of those who draw them up, they undoubtedly serve the double purpose of rendering criticism difficult and supplying an easy official answer. Officials in India are only too apt to make their figures serve this purpose, and the bad habit is encouraged, instead of being checked, at the India Office. Sir Henry Waterfield produced a fresh batch of figures. But these, again, were vitiated by the inclusion of such exceptional items as the charges for Burma. Sir Auckland Colvin, however, took the new figures, and, by means of them, demonstrated again the truth of his contentions that, (1) apart from war and other exceptional charges, there has been between 1887-8 and 1893-4 a great increase in normal military expenditure in India; and (2) that this increase is greater than the increase due to exchange. Another interesting feature of the correspondence was that Sir H. Waterfield invited comparison between the expenditure of 1887-8 and "the revised estimates of 1894-5. "He need not be reminded," was Sir Auckland Colvin's caustic reply, "that comparisons of actuals with estimates is apt to be misleading." It is high time that these misleading comparisons, and the peculiar diversity of methods which renders them possible, were abandoned. It may suit the Government of India so to mystify the man in the street that he loses, if he ever found, any interest in Indian questions. But such mystification will not expedite retrenchment, nor is it creditable to those who produce it. As for the precious theory that exchange is responsible for the increase in military charges, it has been shown, not once but twenty times, to be false. But even if it were true, the Government of India and the Secretary of State would not be free from blame. The exchange-value of the rupee has been falling for the past twenty, and especially during the past ten, years. It was, and is, the duty of the Government of India to take this loss into account, and to cut its coat according to its cloth. Mr. Fowler knows perfectly well that, whether expenditure be shown in this Parliamentary Return or in that, whether it be due to exchange or not, it has to be met by the Indian taxpayer.

Could anything be more amazing than the announcement, lately made by the Secretary of State for India, that the expenses of the Shahzada's visit to England are to be defrayed by the Government—that is to say, by the taxpayers—of India? The proposal will be strenuously resisted not only by the Indian Parliamentary Committee but also, I believe, by many Lancashire members who are concerned for the speedy removal of the cotton duties. The Shahzada came to England on no Indian errand, nor at the suggestion of the Indian people. The matter should be thrashed out in the debate on the Indian Budget, as to which there will be need for the utmost vigilance on the part of the Indian Parliamentary Committee in view of the change of Government.

A series of important memorials from British Indian subjects resident in the South African Republic raises a question which demands the immediate attention of all the authorities concerned. Although, under the Queen's Proclamation of 1858, Indians were definitely admitted to the rights and *status* of the other subjects of the Crown, attempts are being made in South Africa to treat them as an outcast and uncleanly race, to drive them from their houses, to rob them of their occupations, and to herd them together in a place apart. The ostensible pretext for this scandalous and high-handed proceeding is that the habits of the British Indian residents in South Africa are filthy and their practices immoral. But, of course, as the writer on "Indian Affairs" points out in the *Times*:

> "It is needless to say that the Indian Hindus and Mussulmans stand out as examples of bodily cleanliness among Asiatic races, and, we may add, among the races of the world. The ablutions of the Hindu have passed into a proverb. His religion demands them, and the custom of ages has made them a prime necessity of his daily life. As regards their religion teaching 'them to consider all women as soulless and Christians as natural prey,' the Indian memorial to the Secretary of State indignantly remarks: 'Your petitioners ask, can there be a grosser libel on the great faiths prevailing in India or a greater insult to the Indian nation?'"

Ample medical evidence proves the absurdity of the sanitary plea. The true cause of the hostility to the Indians is to be found in the influence which, with their abstemious diet and simple life, they are able to exercise upon prices. A more unworthy or more disgraceful attack upon a section of her Majesty's subjects it is hardly possible to conceive.

The importance of the question in the South African Republic alone may be gauged from the fact that it contains some 200 firms of British Indian subjects, with an aggregate capital of about £100,000; some 2,000 petty traders and boxwallahs of the same race; and about 1,500 others who are employed as shop-assistants, servants, laborers, and so forth. The influential writer to whom I have just referred sums up the whole question in these terms:

> "Are Her Majesty's Indian subjects to be treated as a degraded and an outcast race by a friendly Government, or are they to have the same rights and *status* as other British subjects enjoy? Are leading Muhammadan merchants, who might sit in the Legislative Council at Bombay, to be liable to indignities and outrage in the South African Republic? We are continually telling our Indian subjects that the economic future of their country depends on their ability to spread themselves out and to develop their foreign trade. What answer can our Indian Government give them if it fails to secure to them the same protection abroad which is secured to the subjects of every other dependency of the Crown? The awakening of Asia, to which recent events in Japan have given so powerful an impulse, has already reacted upon India. It will probably result in a large, although gradual, expansion of Indian foreign trade, conducted by Indian capital and by merchants of British-Indian nationality. But it is a mockery to urge our Indian fellow-subjects to embark on external commerce, if the moment they leave India they lose their rights as British subjects, and can be treated by foreign Governments as a degraded and an outcast race."

The matter has already been brought to the notice of Lord Ripon, whose career affords the best possible guarantee that he will deal with it according to the dictates of justice and humanity. If the matter is not settled before Lord Ripon leaves the Colonial Office, the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, who are rightly exerting themselves on behalf of the memorialists, may find themselves called upon to enter into communication with the new Secretary for the Colonies, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain.

A Bankipur correspondent writes:—Scarcely a month passes in which we do not hear of a soldier shooting a native, or killing a native in some less scientific way, and it is found in these cases that the aggressor gets off almost always scot-free. If the cause of death or injury is a gunshot, the shot is always accidental; and if it be a kick, the sufferer is always proved on medical examination to have had a bad spleen. The very uniformity of plea and verdict in these cases is rather curious, and of a kind to give rise to natural suspicion as to the genuineness of the one and the reasonableness of the other. The impression is fast becoming deep and widespread that these cases represent signal failures of justice, and the conviction that the claims of justice and fairness, in cases where a European is guilty and a native seeks redress for injuries, are set aside, is settling deep in the minds of the people. The conviction is not unnatural if one considers the circumstances that are generally connected with these cases. In almost all these conflicts between natives and Europeans, the natives belong to the lower classes, and often they are peasants living in the villages—people who are least likely to offer gratuitous provocation to Europeans, and who are the most helpless in the country owing to their ignorance and want of means. I will cite you a case which recently occurred near Lucknow, in the North-Western Provinces. Two soldiers were out on a shooting expedition and, passing by a village, shot down some pigeons from a pigeon roost. One of them tried to climb a wall to reach the roof of a house on which a pigeon had fallen. The story told by the prosecution was that the owner of the house raised an outcry, suspecting that the soldier intended to violate the privacy of the house. This brought to the scene an angry crowd, and an altercation took place between the soldiers and the villagers, in the course of which one of the soldiers struck a villager with a stick and the other shot one of the villagers through the arm, which had afterwards to be amputated. When matters had reached this stage, the soldiers sought safety by flight, and kept back the pursuing villagers by more shots, and more villagers were injured. A village policeman, however, succeeded in snatching from one of the soldiers his helmet, by which he was afterwards identified. The plea put forward by the defence was that in the course of the altercation a scuffle took place, and the gun went off accidentally. The only material witness on the side of defence was one of the two soldiers mentioned above. The jury consisted entirely of Europeans, and pronounced a unanimous verdict of "not guilty," in which the presiding judge, who also was a European, fully concurred.

I have (my correspondent continues) watched some of the cases, and my opinion is that the failure of justice is due, (i) to the constitution of the trying tribunal; (ii) to the constitution of the jury; and (iii) to the unhappy circumstance that the public prosecutor is a European, and therefore not conversant with the feelings and ways of his client. I do not, in the slightest degree, mean to impugn the integrity of the court or throw any slur upon the conscience of the jury. I believe there are natural disqualifications both in the judge and the jury which are responsible for the miscarriage of justice. There is a wide gulf between the High Court judge and the peasant villager which cannot be bridged over by any degree of enthusiasm for justice or judicial intelligence that can be brought to bear upon the evidence. This natural disqualification is not so fraught with political dangers when the judge has to decide a case between native and native. But in trying a case in which the interests of the ruling and the ruled classes are in conflict, the danger is a serious one, and unscrupulous minds are not unlikely to fall into the temptation of attributing unfair motives to the judge. The jury, again, work under a besetting difficulty, namely, race prejudice, whether they are conscious or unconscious of any such influence. I should be most reluctant to believe that the jurors are ever led by conscious prejudice, but I believe that unconscious prejudice is more dangerous. I believe that in cases like the above the court ought to be a mixed court, *i.e.*, one of the judges ought to be a native and the other European; and that the jury should be half European and half native. This is the only practical means by which a great scandal in our administration of justice can be removed and a serious political danger obviated.

It may or may not be generally known that the East India Association, probably because of that financial pressure which troubles so many public institutions, has suspended the publication of its *Journal*—intermittent though that used to be. By way of partially meeting the difficulty, I understand that such of the Association's "proceedings" as its Chairman and Council deem it desirable to publish will now appear in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*. Two reports of recent proceedings of the Association will, accordingly, be printed in the July number of that valuable review. One of these will be found to possess peculiar importance, as bearing on some of the origins and present influences concerned in that fatal breaking of bounds by the Indian Government under the Salisbury-Lytton *avatar* in 1875-6. The paper to which I allude was read by Mr. T. H. Thornton, C.S.I., D.C.L., at a meeting of the East India Association early in May. It consists mainly of a review of the career and characteristics of the late Colonel Sir Robert Sandeman, whose biography Mr. Thornton has just published through Mr. John Murray. Both the paper itself and the volume will be found attractive not less because of Mr. Thornton's literary skill, than from the, in many respects, attractive qualities of the hero of this political romance. But I am bound to put my readers on their guard against the beguiling sophistication which unconsciously pervaded Mr. Thornton's paper as read before the influential meeting at the Westminster Town Hall.

The argument comes to this: Personal ability in dealing with the tribes and small States beyond the Indian border is everything; Sandeman displayed that ability in remarkable degree in certain circumstances, when he was eminently successful in promoting the then rising movement whereby the Indian Government, abetted by the authorities here, has spread its military strength, extended its political aggressions, and expended many millions of the Indian people's resources in the barren regions beyond the frontier; therefore, this movement—characterised by Mr. Thornton himself as a "revolutionary policy"—is worthy of all acceptation, and as the authorities (Mr. Fowler excluded) are committed to it, we must necessarily call it grand, and thus Philistia should cast its shoe over High Asia. As to the logic of this argument, readers may not think much of it. My purpose is to put them on their guard against being beguiled by the literary skill and personal glamour in which it is enveloped.

As to the other valuable excerpt of the Association's proceedings which is likely to appear in the same *Review*, it consists mainly, I understand, of Sir Richard Temple's valedictory address in retiring from the Presidency of the Association. From what I can gather of the drift of the allocution, it will be found (*a*) to exhibit *in excelsis* the superficial optimism regarding Indian affairs so affectionately cherished by that talented partisan; and (*b*) a choice diatribe against the Indian National Congress and everybody connected therewith.

Mr. H. Morgan Browne, Barrister-at-Law, who has so ably filled the post of Secretary to the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, is about to relinquish his office, as he contemplates taking up professional work at the close of this year. Much as the Committee regret his loss, they still hope that he will be able in his new position to aid in many ways the cause of the people of India, and he has promised, before settling down to practice in India, to revisit as many as possible of the Standing Committees, adjust as far as may be the accounts relating to this journal, and put all these Committees in possession of the British Committee's views as to the present position of affairs in London. Madras is the Presidency in which Mr. Morgan Browne expects to settle, and wherever he does settle he has kindly consented to act as a general agent to the British Committee, for all India, in matters relating to this journal. In the case of non-receipt of copies and the like, all the Committees can refer to him, and he, under instructions from the British Committee, with whom he will be in regular weekly communication, will refer to them about non-receipt of subscriptions and other matters relating to the circulation of this paper. The duties of Secretary to the British Committee will, from October 1st, be jointly discharged by Mr. Gordon Hewart and Mr. W. Douglas Hall. FIDUS.

SIR J. WESTLAND'S BUDGET.

WE beg to direct the attention of our readers to the important Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget which is issued in the form of a special supplement to the present number of INDIA. The Note has been prepared by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, and forwarded to Mr. Fowler by the Indian Parliamentary Committee, together with a covering letter which is reprinted on another page. It is unnecessary to discuss here the conclusions of the Note or the evidence upon which they are based. We shall return to them when the Indian Budget comes up for discussion in the House of Commons—a discussion which, it is earnestly to be hoped, will not be postponed or curtailed by the recent change of Administration. The Note is a sequel to a similar document which was prepared on the Budget of last year, and issued with INDIA for last August. The main contentions throughout are that the Government of India is in error in maintaining that exchange is the sole, or even the principal, cause of Indian financial difficulties, and that the true cause is to be found in the excessive growth of military and civil expenditure. Sir James Westland, unlike Mr. Fowler, referred to the Committee's Note of last year in the recent Budget debate. But his reference to it can hardly be regarded as satisfactory in matter or in manner. In stating that Mr. Fowler had treated the Note with contempt, Sir James Westland was making an unfounded charge against the urbanity of the Secretary of State. In dwelling upon a slight mistake for which he was himself largely responsible, and which did not affect the validity of the argument, Sir James Westland pursued the familiar and inexpensive device of ignoring the real question. The present Note, like its predecessor, goes back to the average of 1882-3 to 1884-5. These years were, as Sir W. Wedderburn shows, a good starting point because they were years of financial equilibrium when the old standard of military expenditure still prevailed. Even if, as Sir James Westland desires, the accounts of 1888-9 be taken as the starting point, the argument of the

British Committee still holds good. The increase of expenditure during that period amounts to more than Rx. 7,000,000, whereas the increase due to exchange amounts to less than Rx. 3,000,000. As for Sir James Westland's amazing demonstration—by the conversion of Indian income and expenditure into pounds sterling instead of rupees—that the burden of the Indian taxpayer has been lightened during the past twelve years, the wonder is that any intelligent audience could have received it with patience. If, as is expected, the change of Government replaces Mr. Fowler at the India Office by an exponent of the "forward" school, whether Lord Lansdowne or Mr. G. N. Curzon, he will have no excuse, with this Note before his eyes, for continuing the costly policy of trans-frontier aggression.

RESULTS IN WAZIRISTAN.

THE Waziristan Field Force returned to India in the middle of March, bringing to an end the war which had begun in October last, and Sir W. Lockhart's despatch, published in the *Gazette of India* of May 11th, reports the operations which were carried on by that force under his command. Our hostilities with the Waziris, however, are of long standing, having commenced fourteen years ago under the following circumstances. The interruptions from floods and landslips to which the Sind-Pishin railway is liable suggested the project of constructing an alternative line to Pishin from Dehra-Ismail-Khan through the Gumâl pass and the Zhôb valley. As the execution of this scheme required the subjugation of the adjacent country, a Waziri Field Force of some 10,000 troops under General Kennedy invaded the tribal territory in 1881. But it failed to subjugate the inhabitants, and the Sherani expedition in 1882, the attempt to survey the Gumâl pass in 1888, and Sir Robert Sandeman's advance from Baluchistan in 1889 were all equally unsuccessful in their attempts to reduce the tribes to submission. In 1890 Sir R. Sandeman, accompanied by the Zhôb Field Force under Major-General Sir George White, succeeded, through negotiations stipulating for the payment of subsidies to several local chiefs, in establishing a post at Apozai, which has been named Fort Sandeman. The tribesmen of the surrounding country, however, repudiated the arrangement, and protested against the presence of our troops in their territory by persistent night-firing into the British camp, by cutting off our soldiers when they strayed from their lines, by attacking our detached parties and by plundering our convoys. We complained of these annoyances to the Amír of Kabul, and endeavoured to induce him, by promises, threats and other diplomatic means, to restrain the hostility of the Waziris. But we succeeded only in obtaining an undertaking from him, in November, 1893, that he would afford no aid and no encouragement to the tribesmen in their resistance to the extension of British rule over their territory as far as Domandi—a spot which we assumed to be on the limit of his own kingdom. The Amír assented at the same time to the south-eastern boundary of his territory being marked out by British and Afghan Commissioners.

The tribesmen, however, regardless of our complaints continued with increasing activity their attacks on our posts, convoys and communications, and as the troops we had on the spot proved unable to prevent these attacks we determined in September 1894 to send an expedition for coercing the tribes into complete submission. A British force under Brigadier-General Turner entered Waziristan for the purpose towards the end of October. On November 3rd his camp was stormed at 5.36 in the morning by three bodies of tribesmen who hamstrung some hundreds of our transport mules, and retired at 6.15, carrying away horses, arms and treasure which they had captured during that short attack. The British loss on the occasion was heavy, our casualties having amounted to 45 killed and 75 wounded, and active operations were stopped, pending the arrival of reinforcements. The Waziristan Field Force, mentioned above, was then organised, and it commenced its operations on December 17th. These operations consisted in traversing the Waziri country from end to end, in destroying many tribal villages and towers, and in capturing grain, fodder, herds and flocks. The country was covered with snow, and the villagers, taken by surprise, could offer no resistance to the soldiers employed in carrying on these depredations. A number of tribesmen, however, fired stray shots at our pickets and rear-guard, and at one of our foraging parties. Our casualties were trivial, amounting during the three months to only 4 killed and 20 wounded. "But," as Sir W. Lockhart states in his despatch, "the losses entailed by severe work "and exposure were considerable, 171 deaths having "occurred from pneumonia alone."

As to the results of this campaign, they have in no way improved our situation. A heavy burden has been cast on the Indian Exchequer, seriously aggravating its difficulties, while our troops may not unreasonably resent being subjected to excessive work and cruel exposure in an enterprise predestined to failure and offering scarcely any chance of achieving military glory and distinction. At the same time the prospects and the career of many of our soldiers has been marred by pulmonary disease and invalidation. A semi-official journal, the *Pioneer*, remarked on May 15th that "although the loss of "life on our side was deplorably heavy solely by "reason of the inclement weather, the tribesmen "have been taught a lesson which will have a "lasting effect." Doubtless hatred for the British and thirst for revenge at our unprovoked aggression will long animate our tribal neighbours; but as regards other effects of the alleged "lesson," recent telegrams show that the tribesmen, far from being cowed by the injury we inflicted on their property and their families, have continued to threaten our posts, and the conviction seems at last to have dawned on the Government of India that their project of a railway through the Gumâl pass, for the execution of which they have expended so much blood and treasure, must now be definitively abandoned.

MR. FOWLER AT THE INDIA OFFICE.

[FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.]

IT cannot be said that Mr. Fowler, who will shortly cease to be Secretary of State for India, has been a success at the India Office. The question which was being asked before the present political crisis arose was "How long shall we have to wait for Mr. Fowler to show in the management of Indian affairs, some of the qualities with which he was credited in English politics?" So vast and intricate is the business of governing India, and so powerful and obstinate is the highly organised hierarchy of permanent officials who control it, that one is always prepared to allow a new Secretary of State a long probationary period during which he may master the situation before beginning to assert himself. The very qualities which gave us high hopes of Mr. Fowler undoubtedly increased the difficulties in his way, and his critics were patient. They well knew that Mr. Fowler, in the course of a long public life, had earned a high reputation as an earnest Liberal, as a strong man of affairs, as the political embodiment of English nonconformity. The qualities which differentiated him from almost all other Ministers and ex-Ministers, and without exception from all previous Secretaries of State for India, were that he was a man of the people; that he was not even remotely connected with that section of the nation which has the instincts and the faults of a governing class; and that he was born and trained among those who make righteousness and conscience their supreme guide even in the competition of trade, the struggles of the law courts, and the manœuvres of political strife. Mr. Fowler's training had brought him into equal comradeship with the poor and oppressed and with those who held religious, social, and political opinions despised by the once dominant class. From such material the noblest and bravest instincts of the English race have sprung, and it has provided the backbone of British democracy at home and the salt of righteousness in British policy abroad. It was in the opinion of many a hazardous experiment to take a provincial lawyer, a man trained in the council chamber of a second-rate municipality and the class-room of a Methodist chapel and make him the ruler of the Indian Empire. But it was an experiment which, in the man selected, promised to supply the corrective to nearly all the evils which soil the fame of the Indian Government. We were prepared to welcome the experiment with hope and almost confident expectation. We watched it with growing apprehension. We waited patiently till at last we were crying with the despairing psalmist, "How long, O Lord, how long?"

Mr. Fowler had had, before the defeat of the Government led to its resignation, a fairly long experience of the India Office—long enough to be seated firmly in the saddle. His period of office was more than usually full and varied. Half a dozen great issues had come to the front, each providing a strong man with an opportunity of showing his power to initiate a new policy or to stand firmly for a great and righteous principle. Is there any instance, besides the tardy decision in regard to Chitral, in which we can say that Mr. Fowler has done well? On all the minor questions of administrative reform, on specific cases of maladministration, he has obediently re-echoed the stereotyped reply of the Indian official. On the question of Simultaneous Examinations he has allowed the House of Commons to be ignored and overridden. In regard to the Enquiry into Indian Expenditure he has apparently been a willing tool in the hands of those who are interested in preventing the only effective enquiry. On the Opium question he trampled with scorn and contumely upon men from whom he might fairly differ in opinion but whose honest aims and noble principles he, more than any man in the whole hierarchy of Indian officialism, ought to have understood and respected.

But it is useless to multiply instances, and we cannot discuss them in detail now. On any instance taken singly Mr. Fowler might perhaps claim a suspense of judgment. It is the accumulated evidence of one great tendency which constitutes the irrefutable testimony of weakness. It is not perhaps so much in great state decisions as in daily conduct and manner that the individual mind is disclosed. It was Mr. Fowler's personal method which first aroused and gradually increased the apprehension of those who are interested in the welfare of India. The strength of noncomformity in public affairs is its moral fervour. The danger which moral fervour incurs in public life is that it may become a habit rather than a passion, a ready and powerful form of political rhetoric rather than a spiritual instinct controlling conduct. At present there is but little room for the "nonconformist conscience" in the Government of India. An official who would be popular with his colleagues must purge himself of that. But there is plenty of scope for a fine display of a rhetorical moral fervour in defence of its blunders and its crimes. Mr. Fowler seemed to place all the great powers of his eloquence and the panoply of his emotional rhetoric at the service of the Simla authorities. If we were inclined to dissect Mr. Fowler's character and conscience it would be an interesting enquiry whether this was due to some inherent flaw in his Liberalism and his human sympathies or whether he was seduced by the pride of power. Observers in the House of Commons hold that the most remarkable transformation recently witnessed upon the political stage was the change which was taking place in the statesman who had been the champion of the humble and oppressed in England, and who was becoming the eloquent apologist for official despotism and irresponsibility in India. Mr. Fowler usually spoke amid the amazement of his former comrades and to the music of Tory cheers led by Sir R. Temple and the extreme Anglo-Indians. He poured the vials of eloquent moral indignation upon the life-long and disinterested advocates of moral reform. His complacent approval of official actions made his speeches on the Budget and general topics one long peroration of eloquent optimism to the tune set by the reports of officials upon their own work. Where was this to end? We supposed, we expected, we hoped that it was a passing phase. We waited for it to pass away. It seemed to be hardening into a settled habit—a gospel of tyranny preached with the fervour of a prophet by a democratic evangelist! Mr. Fowler's career at the India Office has been terminated with dramatic suddenness, and everybody must rejoice that, before he actually retired from office, he had the courage to formulate a decision hostile to the policy of annexation in Chitral. This decision will be regarded by many as the one redeeming feature in Mr. Fowler's record at the India Office.

THE BHOUSLA FUND.

[FROM A CORRESPONDENT.]

On the 5th of March last certain questions were asked in the House of Commons, and replies given by the Secretary of State for India, regarding the case of Rája Raghoji Rao Bhousla, of Nagpur, India, the grandson of the late Rája of Nagpur. These questions and replies had reference to two matters: the palace site of the Bhouslas at Nagpur and what was known as the Bhousla Fund. In November, 1862, some years after the annexation of Nagpur by the British Government, the Government of India wrote to the Local Government at Nagpur: "It is optional with the members of the Bhousla family to occupy the palace on the condition of keeping it in repair;" and in the same letter: "The British Government has no intention of disturbing their occupancy so long as the barley-corn rent and the future repairs are attended to by them." In January, 1864, or a little more than a year after the above letter was written, the palace was nearly destroyed by an accidental fire. Instead of allowing the Rája some time to repair and reconstruct the building in accordance with the above letter, Government took possession, and quickly utilised the "Khasgi" office, called the "Gol" bungalow, as an honorary magistrate's court-house, the stables were converted into a market, and the "Nagarkhana" into police lines. Since that time, owing to the minority of the present Rája, his estate has been managed by the Court of Wards. Certain proposals were made by the Court of Wards to repair and rebuild the palace at the Rája's expense, but they fell through. The present Rája came of age in 1893. Almost simultaneously with that event the Chief Commissioner laid the foundation stone of a Town Hall, to be built on the ancient palace site of the Bhousla family. The Rája was naturally absent from this ceremony, and also declined to be a member of the Town Hall Construction Committee. Before he had attained his majority, however, the Court of Wards obtained the minor's formal consent to a subscription of Rs. 10,000 towards the construction of the Town Hall on the site of his ancestral palace. The Rája and his family have been living ever since the fire in 1862 in a house erected on the site of one of the out-houses of the ancient palace. This the Secretary of State in his replies in the House of Commons calls "a new palace."

At the time of the annexation of Nagpur, the private property of the Rája and his family, consisting chiefly of ornaments, was seized by Government, and sold by auction for less than half its value. The proceeds, amounting to nearly 29 lakhs of rupees, were converted into what was called the Bhousla Fund. In 1871, in a letter declining to forward a petition addressed by Rája Janoji to the Viceroy, Colonel Keatinge, then the Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces, makes the following remarks:

> "It is undoubtedly the case that there existed at one time a fund known as the Bhousla Fund. It was created in 1854, and consisted of the proceeds of the sale of jewels, furniture, and other property belonging to the deceased Ruler of Nagpur."

And in the same letter:

> "The gross amount realised by the sale of the property amounted to Rs. 28,77,212; but many charges had to be defrayed from this amount, and down to the close of 1860-61, Rs. 10,77,531 had already been devoted to meeting these demands. The Fund was finally credited to Government Revenues, and ceased to exist as a separate fund."

This Fund, it is needless to say, was originally intended for the benefit of the family. But more than one-third of the capital was spent by Government in a few years in payment, it was said, of political pensions and allowances to the survivors of the late Nagpur Court. These pensions and allowances were fixed by Government and paid without reference to the Rája. It is difficult to understand why the Bhousla Fund should have been burdened with these payments. The Bhousla family after the annexation had no longer any political existence, and yet the British Government, which had just annexed the Nagpur State, instead of itself paying the political pensions, paid them out of the proceeds of the private property of the Bhousla family. Eventually, as stated in the above letter, Government appropriated the whole of the balance of the Fund, and credited it to its own revenues. These facts were calmly stated by the Secretary of State for India in his replies in the House of Commons without any attempt to explain away their obvious injustice.

But neither of these two matters is the Rája's principal grievance. His chief grievance is that he has never been granted a hearing, nor has any impartial enquiry been made regarding these matters. If any representations were made on his behalf during his minority, they were made by the Court of Wards, which consists of a Govermnent officer, who is practically a defendant in the case. If the Rája himself presented a petition, the Local Government declined to forward it to the Government of India or to grant him a hearing. Even recently, when he in turn petitioned the Local Government, the Government of India, and the Secretary of State, each of these authorities declined in writing to grant him a hearing. Their orders were based solely upon the reports made on the petitions by Government officers who, as already stated, were practically defendants in the case, and the Rája was not granted an opportunity of reply. In short, at no time either before the Local Government, the Government of India, or the Secretary of State, has the Rája been allowed a hearing or an impartial enquiry. All that he desires is that he may be heard in his own case, that a fair, impartial enquiry may be ordered, and an account or explanation of the expenditure of the Bhousla Fund may be called for.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Politically, the United Kingdom was suddenly thrown into confusion and bewilderment by the defeat of Lord Rosebery's Government on Friday, June 21st.

The immediate occasion of the defeat was an amendment moved by Mr. Brodrick on the vote for the War Office, in Committee of Supply on the Army Estimates. Alleging inadequacy in the store of small arms ammunition, he maintained that the policy pursued by the Government of taking only just sufficient money to meet the wants of the year constituted a grave national danger. On a sudden outbreak of hostilities it would, he argued, be discovered that warlike stores could not be procured in a hurry. By way of protest against the existing system he moved to reduce the salary of the Secretary of State for War by the sum of £100.

In spite of the emphatic declarations of Mr. Campbell-Bannerman and Mr. Woodall, on the authority of the responsible military advisers of the War Office, the motion for the reduction of the Vote was carried by 132 votes to 125.

In consequence of this vote Mr. Campbell-Bannerman resigned the post of Secretary for War, and at a prolonged meeting held on Saturday, June 22, Lord Rosebery's Cabinet determined upon resignation. Lord Salisbury was summoned by the Queen and, apparently after some hesitation, accepted office.

Lord Salisbury has become Prime Minister for the third time—almost on the anniversary of the day ten years ago (June 24, 1885), when he assumed that office for the first time. The only other Ministers of the century who have held the highest office in the State as often are Mr. Gladstone (four times Prime Minister) and Lord Derby (three times).

At the time of writing the new Ministry is not yet complete. But the following appointments have been officially announced: Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary, the Marquess of Salisbury; President of the Council, the Duke of Devonshire; First Lord of the Treasury, Mr. A. J. Balfour; Secretary for the Colonies, Mr. Chamberlain; Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; First Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. Goschen.

The Unionist card is understood to be a dissolution at the earliest possible moment, and the campaign of the General Election has already begun on the Unionist side. The sudden development of events is regarded as highly fortunate for Mr. Chamberlain, who is said to have organised the defeat of the Government at this particular moment somewhat to the annoyance of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour.

It is still difficult to determine the date of the dissolution. It may be much more in the control of the Liberal party than the Unionists are disposed to admit. There is on the Liberal benches a strong feeling that not only should the spokesmen of the new Ministry in the Commons be heckled severely as to their intentions with respect to the powder supply which brought about the crisis, but that they should be compelled to disclose their policy on several other important questions before the appeal to the country is permitted. Should Mr. Balfour, when he returns to the House show any signs of treating requests for reasonable information as to policy with contempt, it is probable that there will be protests from the Radical benches when the votes are under consideration.

Precedents for going to the country without passing the Appropriation Bill, and obtaining from the new Parliament an Act of Indemnity, are being paraded in the *Times*, but it is scarcely conceivable that even Lord Salisbury will enter upon a course so full of danger. In some quarters the dissolution is fixed for a few days hence, but the *Times* is perhaps nearest the mark when it suggests that the dissolution will take place at the end of the second or the beginning of the third week in July.

The *Westminster Gazette* for June 26th contained the following editorial note:—We read with astonishment the following statement in the *St. James's Gazette* of yesterday:—

> The Unionists are very much better prepared in the matter of candidates throughout the Midland counties than are the supporters of the Government in the seventy-two constituencies comprising the area of the Midland Union of Conservative Associations. A Unionist candidate is ready to contest every seat held by a supporter of the Government, with the exception of East Wolverhampton, where Mr. Fowler will not be opposed, on condition that Sir Alfred Hickman is allowed to retain his seat in the Western Division.

There was nothing which weakened the Liberals more in the Midlands at the last election than the silence of Mr. Fowler and the rumour that some sort of deal had been made between parties at Wolverhampton. But it is, of course, incredible that Mr. Fowler, now a leader of the Liberal party, should enter into any arrangement for averting opposition to himself on condition that Sir Alfred Hickman should not be opposed. Mr. Fowler is perfectly safe in East Wolverhampton, and it would be a pity if Sir Alfred Hickman's seat were not most stubbornly fought. Other Unionist papers take liberties with Mr. Fowler this morning, and allege that he is going to the House of Lords. This, also, we trust is a *canard*, for Mr. Fowler is one of the best platform men we have, and we shall all expect him to take a a leading part in the Midlands during the next few weeks.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., was among the guests at the Earl of Rosebery's dinner party on June 13th. The other guests were Sir John Austin, Mr. J. W. Benn, Mr. Conybeare, Mr. Cozens-Hardy, Sir Francis Evans, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. J. C. Frye, Mr. Munro-Ferguson, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Hutton, Mr. Kearley, Mr. Roby, Sir Thomas Roe, Mr. Roundell, Canon MacColl and Mr. J. E. Taylor.

Mr. P. E. Percival, the nephew of Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., who lately obtained a high place in the competition for the Indian Civil Service, proposed the other day in the principal Debating Society at Balliol College, Oxford, a motion to the effect that "the Indian National Congress is a movement deserving of hearty support." Mr. Percival was supported by a Hindu and a Muhammadan, while the chief speaker on the other side was an

Indian civilian on furlough. When the division was taken the votes were equal, but, by the casting vote of the president, the motion was carried.

The Dowager Marchioness of Lansdowne is lying dangerously ill at Meiklour House, her seat in Perthshire. Lady Lansdowne, who is in her seventy-sixth year, is the mother of the present Marquess of Lansdowne. Lady Lansdowne, who is Baroness Nairne in her own right, and who owns a large estate in Perthshire, is the eldest daughter of the Comte de Flahault by his marriage with the Baroness Keith and Nairne.

At Oxford on June 4th, the hon. degree of M.A. was conferred by a Decree of Convocation upon Sir Charles Umpherston Aitchison, late Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab and member of the Council of the Governor-General of India. Sir C. Aitchison was presented for the degree by the Public Orator.

Mr. and Mrs. Rudyard Kipling are to sail for India in the autumn. It is stated that Mr. Kipling is collecting materials for a series of articles to be published in the *Cosmopolitan Magazine*, and that he is meditating a book upon life in the backwoods of America.

BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

INTERVIEW WITH MR. W. C. BONNERJEE.

There is no need (writes a representative of INDIA who has "interviewed" Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee) to explain to my Indian readers who and what Mr. Bonnerjee is. But some of the English readers of INDIA may be ignorant that, throughout the length and breadth of India, there is no man who is more highly respected or more implicitly trusted and loved by the Indian people. One of the leaders of the Calcutta Bar, President not once but twice, of the Indian National Congress, and a politician and speaker of high order, Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee is able, as few others are, to indicate the authentic drift of Indian public opinion upon matters of current importance. Needless to add, Mr. Bonnerjee is a highly-cultivated gentleman who knows English affairs and speaks the English language as well as an educated Englishman. Our conversation took place while the Government's decision in regard to the future of Chitral still hung in the balance though it was commonly believed that the decision, when it was announced, would prove to be another victory for the "forward" school. This was naturally the first topic which I broached.

"The Expedition to Chitral," Mr. Bonnerjee replied at once, "has been a colossal blunder from the outset. We have no business to be there at all. The Government of India had no business to send Dr. Robertson there. But it is impossible to keep military officers, especially the younger ones, in check. Our frontier has been extended not because of, but in spite of, good resolutions on the part of the Government both in India and in this country. Ambitious military officers pick quarrels with the tribesmen beyond the British-Indian frontier; then British dignity says that chastisement must follow; and the result is annexation of territory as a matter of course. This series of incidents has been repeated for years past, and I fear that we shall resist in vain until we have reached the Hindu Kush."

"Is not that too despairing a view, when there are military experts like General Sir Neville Chamberlain, General Lord Chelmsford, General Sir John Adye, and General Sir Charles Gough on our side; when, too, we fined financial authorities like Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir David Barbour frankly ascribing the financial embarrassments of the Government of India to the 'perilous growth' of military expenditure?"

"These authorities may be on our side, but so also was Lord Lawrence. Yet his policy was overthrown. What else can we expect? We have had weak rulers in India who have been controlled either by ambitious statesmen in London or by restless soldiers in India. The 'forward' policy costs an enormous amount of money, and does no good whatever? I agree. But does the Viceroy understand that? Why, from the very moment of Lord Elgin's arrival in India, his judgment has been taken captive by the dominant military clique. Colonel Durand is his Military Secretary, and is strongly supported by his brother, Sir Mortimer Durand. Both of them inherit the prestige of their father's name. Lord Mayo, with all his faults, knew his own mind, but so much cannot be said for some of his successors."

"But what of the force of public opinion in this country, and the opposition offered by such journals as the *Spectator*, the *Daily Chronicle*, and the *Manchester Guardian* to the demands of the 'forward' school?"

"Where is the force? Frankly, I do not see its effects either here or in India. The journals you mention have taken a wise line. They perceive the danger which the 'forward' frontier policy would involve in case Russia were to invade India—an invasion, by the way, which I do not think will ever take place. They perceive also that the moment the Chitralis, the Swatis, and the other tribesmen realise that the 'forward' policy is inspired by fear of Russia, they will assume that we are weak and give us trouble. But I have no real hope that the 'forward' policy will be permanently checked. See what is happening in Uganda. A few irresponsible people create the situation; they are in great danger; you must go to their rescue, and the annexation of territory follows. Lord Rosebery has boasted that under Queen Victoria there has been a greater accession of territory to the British Empire than in any previous reign. We Indians believe in the honesty of British statesmen, but all of us view with the greatest apprehension the military policy which is being pursued. Public works are neglected, and education is starved—and for what? India will never reap any benefit from the 'forward' policy, and the advocates of that policy forget that contentment in India would be the best of all barriers against the advance of Russia. The truth is, I suppose, that few Governments have the courage to incur the odium of a policy of 'scuttle'. Our statesmen lack Mr. Gladstone's moral courage. They can make speeches, but somehow they do not give effect to their opinions. Expressions of opinion in the House of Commons have very little effect upon the military officers who are out on the frontier."

"Are you satisfied with Mr. Fowler?"

"By no means. India is greatly disappointed in him, and his meaningless rhetoric about the members of the House of Commons being 'members for India.' He and officials like him talk of the 'dumb millions' of India, and then brush aside Indians who are not dumb. They forget that educated Indians are drawn from the ranks of the people themselves. We have educated men in the big towns in India who come from the villages. Each of them represents his friends, his relatives, and his own village. Hence the strength of the Indian National Congress. I see that it has been stated that the Congress is becoming less representative. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is natural that, when the Congress meets in Madras, many Madrasis should attend, and, when it meets in Calcutta, many Bengalis. One has to remember the long distances which representatives from other parts of India have to travel."

"You do not hold with the orthodox official theory that the financial embarrassments of India are due to loss by exchange?"

"Certainly not. Our embarrassments are due to extravagant policy, and, if it had not been for this policy, the loss by exchange would not have been serious. The exchange compensation allowance is based on a rotten principle. Ever since 1872 the exchange value of the rupee has been falling, and men who have taken service under the Government of India have been well aware of the fact. They have gone out to India with that knowledge. On what principle, then, can it be said that they are entitled to compensation? Salaries in India are much higher than salaries paid to officers holding similar positions in the colonies. At one time, when the rupee was at 2s. 2d., the Government of India offered to pay official salaries in gold. The offer was declined. If the exchange-value of the rupee had gone up, what would have happened? Besides, the downward progress of the rupee touches Indians as well. The non-domiciled European officials are being compensated indiscriminately at the expense of fellow-sufferers. The principles of the arrangement are vicious, and its details are worse. Our revenue is not so elastic as the revenue of England. The principal source of our revenue is land, and the amount is fixed. It cannot be increased, and, in case of famine, it decreases. Could anything be more scandalous than the suspension of the Famine Insurance Fund?"

"One sometimes hears that India has grown lukewarm on the subject of Simultaneous Examinations."

"The statement is a libel. What is the use of holding public meetings now? The country has with one voice declared in favour of Simultaneous Examinations."

"What do you think of the reforms in the Legislative Councils?"

"It is noteworthy that, so far as members are elected, they are everywhere men of the reform party—supporters, that is to say, of the Indian National Congress. Indeed, there is not, I believe, an educated Indian in the service of the Government or out of it who is not, at heart, a Congress-wallah. But the Government of India discourages its servants from taking any part in the movement."

"Official critics suggest, of course, that the Congress is disloyal?"

"Yes, but they do not take the trouble to find out the facts as men like Sir Richard Garth, for example, have done. What the Congress party says in effect is: 'Given British rule for ever and ever, can it be so improved as to make the people contented with it and ready to give an active and intelligent support to it?' We want British rule and, founded on British rule, 'peace, retrenchment and reform.'"

"The Indians who have entered the Civil Service have distinguished themselves?"

"They have, without exception, proved themselves to be superior to the bulk of their English colleagues. Yet their position is extremely difficult. They are jealously watched—though with different kinds of jealousy—by their fellow-civilians and by the Indian people. They have to stand the test not only for themselves, but also for their country. When an Englishman in the Service fails we do not say that the English nation is good for nothing.

"One often sees in Indian newspapers complaints as to the administration of the criminal law."

"The administration of the criminal law in India is simply unspeakable. My experience does not extend beyond Bengal; but I do not hesitate to say that, however vehemently the authorities may disavow the practice in public, in private their theory is 'no conviction, no promotion.' Here is a single instance of the way in which justice is administered. A rich zemindar in the Patna district was accused of having gone with some 200 followers to the field of a poor man and cut his crops. At the time when the charge was made, the zemindar was at Benares. He returned eight days later, and voluntarily surrendered himself to the cantonment magistrate at Dinapur who had taken the complaint. He applied for bail, but it was refused. Thereupon application was made to the Sessions Judge at Patna. The judge consulted the magistrate, and again refused bail. Accordingly application was made to the High Court. Bail was again refused; and the zemindar, a high-caste man, remained in prison, greatly to the detriment of his health. The case was tried. He was acquitted, and it was found that, if the occurrence had ever taken place at all, the zemindar had had nothing to do with it. Yet he had been imprisoned for four weeks. Cases like this—and there are many of them—bring the whole criminal law into disrepute in India."

"As for the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure," Mr. Bonnerjee continued, "I entertain no great hopes of substantial results from its investigations. Expenditure depends upon policy, and the Commission is prevented from enquiring into policy. In the case of the Opium Commission, the Government of India was determined to prove that opium was the greatest blessing conferred upon man by nature. I myself was opposed to the appointment of the Commission. My impression is that a vast majority of the Indian people, men and women, take a little opium in old age, and that the climate is such that, often, they take it with beneficial results. But it struck me as singular that doctor after doctor came forward and spoke of beneficial effects being produced by opium, and yet not one of them ever prescribed it for his patients. The Commission ought to have examined the native physicians—*Kabirajes* and *Hakims*. These men are of the people, and know them best. The Commission went to India for the purpose of taking evidence, but the men who could have told it most were not called."

"You seem," I said, "to take a generally despondent view of the position and prospects of India."

"Yes, I am inclined to be despondent when I think how little effect public opinion in England has upon Indian policy. There is so much jealousy in Parliament between the 'ins' and the 'outs.' If the 'ins' do anything for India, the 'outs' attack it. Also, there is the new type of Anglo-Indian to reckon with, who captures the press at home and jeers at all native progress. For the rest, it is a case of 'out of sight, out of mind.' A fire in London, causing the death of a handful of people, would produce a greater sensation in England than a famine in India, causing the death of millions of people. It is this indifference which aids a bureaucratic policy, especially as retired Anglo-Indians and merchants and all their relatives are so well content with the *status quo*."

"But the Indian Parliamentary Committee is making its influence felt?"

"The work of the Indian Parliamentary Committee is most beneficial. It is likely to do a great deal of good. Nothing could be better for India than that there should be a vigilant party watching the interests of the country in the House of Commons. The hostile criticisms of bureaucrats like Lord Lansdowne show that the Committee is doing great good. If your policy is a wise policy, what have you to lose by having it thrashed out in the House of Commons? But it is important to get some portion, however small, of Indian expenditure charged upon the British Exchequer—not in order to secure financial aid, but in order to make the British public scrutinize the action of their agents, the Government of India. There is another reform which India needs—the generous extension of education, both primary and secondary. Let me add, in conclusion, that care must be taken to prevent higher education from being starved by primary education."

EMPIRE OF INDIA EXHIBITION. I.

(BY OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.)

Even as India is the Koh-i-nur of the jewels of the Empire, so is the Exhibition which Mr. Imre Kiralfy has conceived, designed, and executed among all other exhibitions. "There has been nothing like it since the Crystal Palace was opened in 1851," said one who knows all about these great shows, and the public seem to agree with him, for on the Saturday in June previous to the visit of the representative of INDIA 72,000 people were admitted to the grounds. The exhibition stands on a spot sacred to the memory of defunct exhibitions in the West of London. Phœnix-like, it has arisen out of their ashes, more beautiful and much larger than any of its predecessors. The acres of land which it covers number six-and-twenty; half of this extent is roofed in. It has cost £150,000 to build, a sum which does not include the price paid for leases of land extending to twenty-one years. There has been for many months an army of workmen engaged in constructing it, varying from 1,500 to 2,000. They have been brought from North, South, East and West. Britons, Belgians, Frenchmen, Germans, have worked at the great exhibition. It goes without saying that it is not yet finished. When was an exhibition ever finished, save when it was closed?

Mr. Imre Kiralfy has not evolved the exhibition from his head, as it were, in the way in which the immortal Beethoven produced a sonata. The great Hungarian organiser went to India, and under excellent direction travelled in our vast Empire. The result is undoubtedly fine, and increases Mr. Kiralfy's reputation for taste and enterprise. He is backed by a powerful ring of capitalists who have formed themselves into the London Exhibitions Company. Rájas and Máhárájas have helped, have found suitable Indian workers, lent valuable collections and done all in their power to forward Kiralfy's conception. The Máhárájas of Baroda, Kutch-Behar, Kolhapur and Travancore have especially given every kind of assistance.

One remarkable feature of the Exhibition is its situation, well-known of course to Londoners, but yet worth explaining to the readers of INDIA who dwell in their own land. Earl's Court lies at a railway junction. The grounds are scattered, divided by the lines, so that three separate bridges have had to be constructed over the District, West London Extension, and Midland Railways. Now, London railways far surpass in their squalid ugliness anything that the mind of man ever before conceived. Together they form the nadir of civilisation, the Gehenna of London. It is to the honour of Mr. Imre Kiralfy, to the credit of his artistic taste, that he realised that no man could be happy in the Exhibition grounds if he still could be confronted by Gehenna, even with a band playing, and with a hundred thousand gas jets and electric bulbs disposed in fantastical devices. So they erected great poles, and painted gigantic canvases — but what matters it how it was done? The magician waved his wand, and on the one side lie snowy peaks, the peaks of Narkunda visible on a clear day at Simla, as you descend from Jaku by the path near Christ Church; on the other are the domes of mosques, the long minarets, the palms, the poepuls, the temples, all the features of an Eastern city. And the wicked outer world is utterly shut out for as many hours as visitors can spare. For this boon alone Mr. Kiralfy deserves a hymn of praise or something equivalent.

Passing through the Ducal Hall—which has nothing very ducal about it, unless pyramids of soaps and sauces, Bombay ducks and chutnee deserve this appellation—one comes to the Queen's Court, with its fine lake, fountain, bandstand, electric boats, shaped like craft on the Hughli, gliding round in silence. The two bridges crossing the lake remind one a little of the bridge leading to the Golden Temple at Amritsar. The whole effect is fine, dazzling, white—perhaps the heat which the white buildings reflect on a hot day is more characteristic of India than the whiteness. Much the same may be said of the Imperial Court, with its imposing colonnade, oval in shape, charmingly decorated with parterres of palms and flowers. In it thousands of people can lounge and stroll, listening to the music of an excellent band.

The Queen's Palace deserves more than a passing word, for it contains the Fine Art and Loan Exhibits —interesting relics of the East India Company and a fairly good collection of pictures. Interesting as they are, the exhibits strike one as doing less than justice to the undoubted excellence of Indian Art. A good proportion of the articles exhibited, such as tablecloths, quilts, saris, men's coats, are more remarkable for the tremendous amount of minute hand-labour bestowed upon them than for genuine artistic effect. The writer has seen in Agra, Delhi, Bombay, in the shops of the merchants up creaking old stairs, more exquisite embroideries spread out on the floor for private inspection than are to be seen at the Exhibition, specimens of a taste so refined and delicate that one instantly acknowledged the reality of Indian Art. But it is more easy to cavil than to appreciate, and undoubtedly much remains here to be admired. In this case are the charters of the East India Company, the first one dated 1600, signed by Elizabeth. Its renewals by James I. and succeeding monarchs, not omitting our King of Kings, Cromwell, by William III., our next best modern king, dated 1698, are exhibited too. There are letters patent conferring rights and dignities on mighty personages, and a quaint old volume containing the names, with amounts against them, of those who held the stock of the East India Company —all serving to remind the student of history that England trades first, and governs as a result. Here is a ticket of admission to the trial of Warren Hastings. On the wall hangs his portrait. Unless the painter, Sir T. Lawrence, belied him, there was more than a touch of moral weakness visible on his face. Other cases contain relics of Tipu Sahib, such as his watch, hunting jacket, walking stick; a beautiful silver shield, in high relief, of Sir James Outram's; many fine specimens of jewellery and carving. Some models of temples and Indian palaces deserve mention.

"Where is the silver trumpet blown at Delhi, when the Queen was proclaimed Empress in 1878?" said I to a fine specimen of the Defenders of the Empire, dressed in khakee, a solar topee on his head.

"It wasn't in 1878, it was New Year's day, 1877," said the Defender. "I was there and heard it."

Then followed a few questions and much information on the soldier's part, who, after fourteen years of India and not a day's sickness, gave it as his opinion, the result of experience, that no man who regards his health should eat meat in the plains between April and October, that abstinence from liquor is a good thing, that the white soldier in India might easily do a little more work without injury to health, and that the men who go out nowadays are poor creatures compared with those of John Company, and the years immediately following its retirement from the political sphere. All this followed by enthusiastic praise of "Bobs, God bless him."

On the walls are some fine carpets made in Agra gaol, and some hangings which lose effect through being tacked flat on the wall, instead of being hung. There are also capital pictures by Mr. E. L. Weekes, formerly exhibited in the Paris Salon, and calling to mind many an Indian scene. The treatment of light, one of the greatest features of modern painting, deserves more than a passing word of praise, so vivid is the bright sunshine.

SCHOOLS FOR MARRIED INDIAN GIRLS.

Mrs. (Sowbhagyavati only means Mrs.) Nikambe's name and her appearance too are distinctly oriental. As I sat in a lofty London drawing-room talking to her, I wondered (writes a representative of India) how any one so un-English-looking, with dark skin, coal-black hair and eyes, with a gracefully draped sari, altogether a typical oriental woman, could speak English almost without the faintest *nuance* of an accent. She soon explained, at least partially, how it was.

"I am a native of Bombay, but then for three generations my people have been Christian. When I was nine years old, my people placed me as a boarder in an English school at Bombay, where I was the only native girl. I remained till I was eighteen, and I think the complete severance between myself and my relatives explains why I became so English."

"Perhaps it does, but I have known people who have been twenty or thirty years in a foreign land, and yet retained a very strong flavour of their native tongue. Now will you tell me about your school for married Indian girls. Why did you begin it?"

"I was a teacher in the Students' Literary and Scientific Society's Schools at Bombay. There are four of them in different localities. I could not help noticing that when girls marry, and with us they often marry very young, at twelve, thirteen, fourteen, they leave school, and though their minds are quite unformed, their bodies too for that matter, they withdraw to a much greater degree of seclusion than they had before, the very sort of seclusion which needs a higher degree of education to make it endurable."

"Yet I have often seen married girls in Hindu schools. Why need they give up?"

"Our people do not yet quite see the necessity of educating women. It would be useless to reason on the subject; the ideas of my people are opposed to it, and they must be considered. Besides, the teachers in the schools are generally all men, and often not advanced enough. These teachers may have reached the seventh Marathi Standard or Fifth English, but that is not far enough. And then, the girls need special consideration, a curriculum that will suit their circumstances."

"Would it be right to say that the Hindu mother-in-law objects to education for the girls by men?"

"Quite correct, but then the men would also be on her side, and all our habits and customs, so that she alone must not be blamed. For this reason in 1890 I opened a special school for married girls at Girgaun, in Bombay. I can take fifty, and as we now have that number, am wishful to enlarge it. I am thus able to ask for girls who are leaving the Society's and other schools, where education is elementary, and get them to continue their studies under me."

"I suppose that in a well-to-do family there is no need for a married girl to stay at home and work?"

"Not usually, though that depends upon the family. In a comfortable Hindu community there are only two chief daily meals, although, like you, we have minor meals between, chiefly milk, sweets, cake, peje (porridge) in the afternoon."

"How do they manage to pass the time?"

"They embroider. You may remember how much men wear small round embroidered caps in Bombay. Ladies embroider servants' caps, too, their own saris, and children's clothes. Gold embroidery is used for their own dress. Then they spend a long time on their toilet. They often wash their hair, aiming at having as much perfume and spice in it as possible. Then they string blossoms and wreathe them on their hair. They have a good deal of jewellery, too. A Hindu mother is always expected to spend almost all her time with her children. Even if there is a nurse, she only takes occasional duty."

"They say that is why Hindu children are so spoiled."

"They are spoiled in more ways than one. You see, the parents are often far too young and immature. The children are sickly, entrusted too much to the care of an inexperienced girl, inexperienced in every way. A girl with us is usually married at ten, and goes to live with her husband at 13, 14, 15. The young man may be 18 or upwards. Certainly we need reform here."

"Are Indian women happy in their secluded homes? You know some English people represent them as miserable, although well-informed people always contradict such statements."

"Mostly they are happy; a little dull, perhaps, but then our people must not be measured by your standard. Perhaps I ought to say they are contented rather than happy. Sometimes a girl enters a community (you know that we do not live in families as you do) where she is not well received, not welcome. Her *rôle* is then almost always to win her new relatives by submissiveness and gentleness."

"Her friends don't interfere to protect her against minor persecution?"

"No, it would only make her task longer and harder. She has to trust to herself."

"Won't education make your girls less submissive when relatives-in-law are unkind?"

Shevantibai mused a moment. "I don't think so. Patience and gentleness are largely national characteristics. Our present idea is not to give women a university education, but to make them more useful in their homes. The rest will follow. I think education will induce later marriages, and it probably would make women more tolerant to strangers who enter their community."

"Is it not true that Indian women are still the great upholders of child marriage?"

"I think so. Some men have ceased to believe in it, but you know, men must side with their women. It is the women who arrange the marriages; in general, they have more influence in such matters than the men."

"At what age did you marry?"

"Oh, I was twenty," said Shevantibai gaily. "It was considered a great age among my Hindu friends; almost improperly old. Yes," was the answer to another question, "I go a great deal to my pupils' houses and interest myself in their domestic affairs. They are only to be won gradually, and by establishing friendly relationships. It would be a great mistake not to cultivate the acquaintance of the older women; I should lose hold."

"Will you tell me now what you *teach* your girls?"

"English and Marathi of course. We always want them to make progress with English, because Marathi literature as a rule is not of a kind to be helpful, our aims being what they are. Much of it consists of astounding events which befel the gods, not very useful knowledge. History and geography are taught in both languages, according to the pupil's degree of advancement; literature, mathematics, domestic economy, sewing, music."

"Do they like mathematics?"

"Not much, and we don't push it where they are not likely to need it at present. Now the last three subjects I have named are directly useful in the life they will lead. We use a domestic economy textbook applicable to Indian life, and the girls quite enjoy the lessons."

"Does the mother-in-law ever show annoyance when a girl wants to come to school?"

"Oh yes, if she is of the old school. A favourite way of quenching enthusiasm is to pile as much housework on the scholar as possible. Among the more ignorant it is not respectable to come to school after you are grown up. Quite a young widow with a little boy has persisted in coming to us despite her parents' objections. She urges that her education will be useful to her boy afterwards. Then I have another girl whose mother-in-law discovered that her handwriting was better than her son's. It made her very angry. She removed the girl from school, saying that presently the boy would need to stay at home and mind the house and the girl go to business, which would be a disgrace to the family."

"Yes, we have often had these arguments in England," said I.

"Then the mothers-in-law tell the girls their husbands won't think so much of them if they are educated. Of course, but not as a direct retort to that, we show the girls how little time their husbands spend with them, a result of their inability to converse upon any subject of interest."

"I am told Hindu girls are very quick."

"It is true. I have rarely had a dull pupil; the average of intelligence is high."

"Is it not a disadvantage for you to be a Christian, Shevantibai. Does it not close many doors to you?"

"I don't think it does in Bombay because it is a cosmopolitan city. But it might in the Mofussil.

I, on the other hand, retain some Hindu customs in dress and living. It is useless to fly in the face of people in matters into which principle does not enter."

Shevantibai has now been ten months in England and shortly returns to her own land. She has written an Indian story called "Ratanbai," which she is even now seeing through the press. Lady Harris, wife of the late Governor of Bombay, has written the preface. During her absence the school is conducted by two ladies who are doing their utmost to induce women of the Gujarathi Hindu community to join in large numbers.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

The following announcement of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure appeared in the *London Gazette* for May 31st:

Whitehall, May 30, 1895.

The Queen has been pleased to issue a Commission under Her Majesty's Royal Sign Manual to the following effect:

VICTORIA, R.I.

VICTORIA, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, Empress of India, etc., to—

Our right trusty and well-beloved Reginald Earle, Baron Welby, Knight Grand Cross of our Most Honourable Order of the Bath;

Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor, Leonard Henry Courtney;

Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor, William Lawies Jackson;

Our trusty and well-beloved George Nathaniel Curzon, Esquire, commonly called the Honourable George Nathaniel Curzon;

Our trusty and well-beloved Sir William Wedderburn, Baronet;

Our trusty and well-beloved Sir Donald Martin Stewart, Baronet, Knight Grand Cross of Our Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Knight Grand Commander of our Most Exalted Order of the Star of India, Companion of Our Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire, Field Marshal of our Forces, Member of the Council of India;

Our trusty and well-beloved Sir Edward Walter Hamilton, Knight Commander of Our Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Assistant Secretary to the Commissioners of Our Treasury for Great Britain and Ireland;

Our trusty and well-beloved Sir James Braithwaite Peile, Knight Commander of Our Most Exalted Order of the Star of India, Member of the Council of India;

Our trusty and well-beloved Sir Andrew Richard Scoble, Knight Commander of Our Most Exalted Order of the Star of India, one of Our Counsel learned in the Law;

Our trusty and well-beloved Ralph Henry Knox, Esquire, Companion of Our Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Accountant-General of Our Army;

Our trusty and well-beloved George Lisle Ryder, Esquire, Companion of Our Most Honourable Order of the Bath;

Our trusty and well-beloved Thomas Ryburn Buchanan, Esquire, Barrister-at-Law;

Our trusty and well-beloved William Sproston Caine, Esquire; and

Our trusty and well-beloved Dadabhai Naoroji, Esquire; Greeting!

Whereas We have deemed it expedient that a Commission should forthwith issue to enquire into the administration and management of the Military and Civil expenditure incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council, or of the Government of India, and the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India for purposes in which both are interested;

Now know ye, that We, reposing great trust and confidence in your knowledge and ability, have authorised and appointed, and do by these Presents authorise and appoint, you, the said Reginald Earle, Baron Welby; Leonard Henry Courtney; William Lawies Jackson; George Nathaniel Curzon, commonly called the Honourable George Nathaniel Curzon; Sir William Wedderburn; Sir Donald Martin Stewart; Sir Edward Walter Hamilton; Sir James Braithwaite Peile; Sir Andrew Richard Scoble; Ralph Henry Knox; George Lisle Ryder; Thomas Ryburn Buchanan; William Sproston Caine; and Dadabhai Naoroji; to be Our Commissioners for the purposes of the said enquiry.

And for the better effecting the purposes of this Our Commission, We do by these Presents give and grant unto you, or any five or more of you, full power to call before you such persons as you shall judge likely to afford you any information upon the subject of this Our Commission; and also to call for, have access to, and examine, all such books, documents, registers, and records, as may afford you the fullest information on the subject; and to inquire of and concerning the premises by all other lawful ways and means whatsoever.

And We do by these Presents will and ordain that this Our Commission shall continue in full force and virtue; and that you, Our said Commissioners, or any five or more of you, may from time to time proceed in the execution thereof and of every matter and thing therein contained, although the same be not continued from time to time by adjournment.

And We do further ordain that you, or any five or more of you, have liberty to report your proceedings under this Our Commission from time to time, if you shall judge it expedient so to do.

And Our further will and pleasure is, that you do, with as little delay as possible, report to Us under your hands and seals, or under the hands and seals of any five or more of you, your opinion on the matters herein submitted for your consideration.

And for the purpose of aiding you in your inquiries, We hereby appoint Our trusty and well-beloved Richmond Thackeray Willoughby Ritchie Esquire, to be Secretary to this Our Commission.

Given at Our Court at *Saint James's*, the twenty-fourth day of *May*, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, in the fifty-eighth year of Our reign.

By Her Majesty's Command,
Henry H. Fowler.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of India cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to India (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with India, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of India can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., Trinity Street, Cambridge; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

India presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.
LONDON, JULY, 1895.

DEMOCRACY AND IMPERIALISM.

By A. E. Fletcher.
(Late Editor of the *Daily Chronicle.*)

"Are you not proud of this vast empire upon which the sun never sets?" This is a question which I am often asked by members of the great Jingo party who charge me with being a "little-England" man. "Yes," I reply, "I am very proud of it, but not for the same reason that you are. Your pride in British Imperialism is based upon its past history. Mine is aroused by the prospect of its future possibilities." Of the past I am not particularly proud, even after making due allowance for the splendid devotion, energy, and heroism displayed on various occasions by certain naval and military commanders and the brave men who served under them. I frankly own that I am no great admirer of the method of procedure adopted as a rule by our sovereigns and statesmen in promoting what the late Professor Seeley called "the expansion of England." By the way, how insular our imperialist devotees are. Why should they speak of the expansion of England, considering that Scotsmen and Irishmen and Welshmen have had their full share of the hard work in the expansive process?

Nothing disgusts me more than the arrogant assumption, the foolish boasting of the Imperialist party. Their perpetual pæans to "the flag that's braved a thousand years the battle and the breeze," their constant boast about the indomitable prowess of the British arms, their foolish adoration of the policy of gunpowder and glory are enough to make serious men ashamed of their species. As a matter of fact no nation has suffered greater military disasters than we have. We tried hard throughout a bloody struggle, lasting for over a hundred years, to expand our empire in Europe, with the result that notwithstanding the supposed glory of Crecy, Poictiers, and Agincourt, of which we still boast, we were thrust out of the Continent bag and baggage, with the loss of every inch of territory we possessed there. We not only lost an empire in France, but a still more splendid empire across the Atlantic, through a series of naval and military disasters. Militarism therefore has been responsible for the contraction of England even more than for her expansion. If our bitter experience of the past in Europe and in America is to be repeated in Asia—in other words, if we are ever to lose our empire in India—it will be through the folly and madness of excessive militarism.

"They that take the sword shall perish by the sword." No more statesmanlike utterance than that ever fell from human lips. The truth of it has been illustrated in the history of all the military empires of the past. Let us take care that it is not further illustrated in the history of our rule in India. You cannot conquer by the sword. You can found no enduring empire upon bayonets. Hence we are not yet masters of India, and we never shall be until we have won the hearts of the Indian people, and proved to them by wise and just administration, in which the flower of the native manhood must take their rightful share, that the object of our government there is not greed or imperial glorification but the happiness of the governed. It cannot honestly be said that this has been the object of British Imperialism in the past. We went to India for the same reason that we are now going to Africa, namely, for the lust of plunder and the lust of power; and we are repeating in Africa the barbarous methods we adopted in India.

Nothing, it seems to me, is more discreditable in the recent history of our Imperial expansion than the sanction which the Imperial Government has given to the proceedings of the Stock-exchange gamblers, land-grabbers and fillibusters, known as the Chartered Company of South Africa, organized and financed by Messrs. Cecil Rhodes and Co. There is no more pathetic story in our imperial annals than that of the unfortunate Lobengula. Yet the infamous proceedings by which that unhappy prince was robbed of his territory and many thousands of the brave Matabele, who had nothing better to defend themselves with than assegais, were mown down by Mr. Rhodes's Maxims and seven-pounders were applauded by the yells of the whole Jingo press, approved by Her Most Gracious Majesty, who made Mr. Rhodes a Privy Councillor for his "services," and received the blessing of a bishop of the English Church, who had the temerity to defend the Matabele War in the national pulpit in Westminster Abbey. This right reverend prelate, it was afterwards discovered, was a shareholder in Mr. Rhodes's greedy company. A bishop booming the Chartered Company over the grave of David Livingstone in the national temple was surely a sight for gods and men. Everybody knows the real object of the Matabeleland invasion. The object was gold, and the pretence that it was undertaken in the interests of Christianity and civilisation is the most shameless hypocrisy of which even Englishmen have ever been guilty.

Besides, what right have we to assume that we have a monopoly of civilisation, and that it is our mission to subject alien races all over the world to its conditions? In India there is a far more ancient and in many respects a far better civilisation than our own. Even the native African tribes are in many respects more civilised than we are. They have neither gaols nor workhouses, nor gin shops, nor gambling hells, nor other dens of infamy which we consider necessary to our beautiful civilisation. Moreover they are Collectivists to a man, and sink the interests of the individual in the interests of the tribe. I do not mean to say that we should confine our energies within the limit of these small islands. I do not say that we have no right to seek to expand our empire by peaceful means. It seems to be a necessary condition in the evolution of mankind that the English-speaking people should spread themselves all over the world and I have no objection whatever to Great Britain's annexing the whole solar system, if it can be done by legitimate means, and without the assistance of violent methods which, however they may temporarily promote imperial aggrandisement, spell in the long run imperial ruin.

Diplomacy is more powerful than the sword. A remarkable instance of the way in which native races in Africa can be conciliated by diplomacy occurred a few years ago when we very nearly blundered into a second Ashantee war. We threatened the Ashantee King with a repetition of the invasion which had proved so disastrous to his father. He laughed at our threats of armies and navies and rather rejoiced in the prospect of having a chance of venging his father's defeat. Fortunately it suddenly occurred to the British representative on the West Coast—I think it was the late Sir William Rose—that this dusky monarch had a mortal dread of the electric telegraph. Sir William therefore went to his majesty to inform him that if he did not come to terms the Great White Queen had decided to put down a telegraph wire up to the borders of his dominions. He was so alarmed that he signed the treaty at once. This story was told at a public banquet of the Institute of Civil Engineers by Lord Kimberley himself, who was Colonial Secretary at the time of the incident. The story shows how much can be done by skilful diplomacy, and how very tractable the African races are if only you know how to get at them. I cannot help thinking that every one of the thirteen barbarous wars that we have waged in South Africa might have been prevented if we had paid as much attention to the training of skilled diplomatists as we have paid to the training of skilled murderers. There is too much reason to fear that since Mr. Rhodes's triumphs in South Africa the natives are being exploited much in the same way as that in which the natives of India were exploited by the English "Nabobs" after Clive had disposed of Surajah Dowlah. The story of the greed of these unscrupulous ruffians is a sad chapter in the history of the "expansion of England," and there are other equally sad chapters in that history which make me hesitate to own that I am very proud of it.

What has been the result of our occupation of India? For a hundred and fifty years we have held precarious sway there over various kindreds, races and tribes, peace-loving for the most part, destitute of the vices which degrade Europeans, and possessed of virtues which forced men like Outram to exclaim "I have loved the people of India." The vast territory which they inhabit, moreover, is full of natural resources and is one of the most fertile regions on the surface of this planet, and yet the majority of these vast millions of India are probably the poorest people on the face of the earth. Their average annual income is scarcely equal to the weekly wage of an average British workman. We have annually piled upon them a burden of taxation which is fast coming to the breaking point, and the enormous revenue derived from this colossal taxation is chiefly devoted to the maintenance of the most costly military system the world has ever known. So long as we keep up this vast military organisation we shall constantly be committed to a "spirited frontier policy," for it is inevitable that you cannot keep up a big army without occasionally giving it something to do, especially under the conditions of service in India.

But though I am not proud of the past history of British India as a whole, I yield to none in my admiration of the many brilliant episodes in that imperial drama. The past is gone and the future is to come, and no man I think who has paid any attention to the signs of the times can look into the future without indulging in the hope that a brighter day will dawn for India and that much will be done in the hereafter to atone for the blunders and the crimes of the past. The English democracy is being awakened to a sense of the gravity of the Indian problem, and as the ranks of the more enlightened and progressive sections of the community are being constantly recruited by a new generation of voters trained in our public elementary schools and elsewhere, higher ideals of imperial duty will be fostered. As the new democracy grows in strength and power —a growth which seems to me inevitable unless our educational system is a failure—Liberalism must advance. Our mental horizon must be widened, our common human sympathies broadened; the old vulgar notions of patriotism which made that term synonymous with parochialism, or still worse with jingoism, will break down before those larger conceptions of international co-operation and good-will upon which the future happiness of the world depends. Similarly the old materialistic ideas which based imperial greatness upon violence, aggrandisement, and greed, will be abandoned in favour of the true imperial idea which is that empires, like individuals, should strive not to be envied and feared, but to be trusted and loved. Already the people of the United Kingdom are becoming more impressed with this idea. Already they are taking a more sympathetic interest in the questions affecting the welfare of their Indian fellow-subjects. The demand for Home Rule all round, the concession of which is becoming more and more regarded as the way out of the Irish difficulty, will soon also be regarded as the true evolution of the Indian difficulty. Home Rule for India will be the battle cry of general elections in the future. I believe the time is not distant when a contingent of intelligent natives of India, capable of voicing the aspirations of the democracy both of their own country and of ours, will sit in the House of Commons and when the administration of Indian affairs will be entrusted more and more to native ability and devotion. If to hold these views is to be regarded as a "little-England" man I gladly accept the title. I am conscious, however, that those who are seeking to carry out these views of our imperial duty are the true Imperialists, the true promoters of a great empire—an Empire great in its peaceful commerce and industrial enterprise; great in its literature, its science, its art; great in its efforts for the rightful distribution of wealth, and in its self-sacrificing energy in the realisation of high ideals of citizenship and duty; great, not by reason of the extension of its military frontier, but in the strength of its moral position—an empire great for toleration, for justice, and for humanity.

A. E. Fletcher.

CHITRAL AND KABUL.

By J. Dacosta.

In reply to Sir W. Wedderburn's question whether the Government, before taking action as regards Chitral, would afford the House an opportunity of expressing its views on the subject, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said on the 30th May that, "when the policy is decided on, the House will certainly be informed of it." A leading article in the *Times* of the following morning, however, showed that action had already been taken for the retention of Chitral and the construction of a road thither, and it was added that surely "Lord Rosebery and Mr. Fowler would not refuse to endorse a policy already adopted by Lord Elgin and his advisers."

To the nation perhaps it will be manifest that those ministers would incur very grave responsibility, if, in direct opposition to the views recently declared by the highest military authorities in the British Empire, they sanctioned the suggested policy without consulting the representatives of the nation—a policy which is certain to involve us in further warfare with our tribal neighbours. The supporters of that policy urge that our duty to our allies in the late campaign and to the hostile tribesmen themselves forbids our retiring from Chitral. Who are these allies, and what permanent engagements have we contracted with them? What duty can call us to protect tribesmen who reject our proffered protection and only claim to be left alone?

The supporters of the policy also refer to Lord Roberts's letter to the *Times*, published in April last, and they deduce from the views expressed in it, that the permanent occupation of Chitral by a British garrison is essential to the safety of India against an eventual Russian attack from the North. In short, the policy is, to all intents and purposes, the "forward" or "scientific frontier" policy initiated in 1876, which no military authority, charged with the safety of our Indian Empire, ever came forward to endorse, and the adoption of which has resulted in failure, disasters, loss of prestige and national humiliation. While certain views expressed in Lord Roberts's letter are interpreted in support of that policy, we must not forget that other views, pointing in precisely the opposite direction, have also been expressed by his lordship; and that, when writing under official responsibility, he said:

> "The longer and more difficult the line of communication is, the more numerous and greater the obstacles which Russia would have to overcome; and far from shortening one mile of the road, I would let the web of difficulties extend to the very mouth of the Khyber. Should Russia in future years attempt to conquer Afghanistan or invade India through it, we should have a better chance of attaching the Afghans to our interests, if we avoid all interference with them in the meantime."

Again, speaking of the tribesmen, Lord Roberts, far from approving our occupation of their territories and our constructing roads through their country, said: "The best thing to do is to leave them as much as possible to themselves." These views have neither been revoked nor modified, and, as they completely apply to the present situation, it seems scarcely fair in those who appeal to his lordship's authority to ignore them in the present discussion.

If we now turn from conflicting opinions to the lessons of actual experience, and compare the situation at Chitral with the situation of the British army at Kabul in 1879-80, their similarity on important points cannot fail to strike those who have watched the vicissitudes of our trans-frontier wars in the regions in question. In September 1879, 10,000 British troops under General Roberts marched on Kabul to avenge the death of a British envoy. The perpetrators of the outrage were Afghan tribesmen from Herat, who, entering Kabul shortly after the arrival of Sir Louis Cavignari, traversed the city crying out insultingly—"why suffer this *Káfar elchi*" (infidel envoy)—and, a few days later ruthlessly massacred the British representative and every man belonging to his staff and his escort. On the arrival of the British army at Kabul on the 10th October, these tribesmen departed for their villages; and the mission intrusted to our army required that they should be pursued and punished; but experience had shown that to pursue hostile tribesmen dispersed in their mountains, was to court disappointment and disaster. At all events the Herati tribesmen were not pursued, and our vengeance for the death of our envoy was wreaked, not on the actual murderers, but on a number of men whom we arrested in and around Kabul, whom we charged with connivance at the outrage, and put to death, after convicting them on such evidence as we could procure. We imposed at the same time a fine on the inhabitants of Kabul for their assumed connivance and participation in the affair; and had that fine been levied and the British army then returned to India with the treasure it had seized, its mission would have been accomplished, so far as the accomplishment was practicable. But the British Cabinet, unduly elated at the early fall of Kabul and the dispersion of the tribesmen who had opposed our advance, resolved upon permanently occupying the country. Governors were appointed to certain provinces and the *Times* correspondent telegraphed in December that Afghanistan was to all intents and purposes a conquered country, which our troops could traverse from North to South without hindrance. While this gratifying but unwarrantable announcement was being read in London, General Roberts's army was in full retreat before an army of tribesmen, abandoning guns, treasure and the city of Kabul, and seeking safety in the cantonments at Sherpur, which were then suddenly put in a state of defence.

The similarity alluded to above does not at present extend beyond the facts that, on both occasions a British army invaded Afghan tribal territory to avenge the death or rescue the person of a British envoy; on both occasions the Indian Government heavily subsidised tribal chiefs for securing their aid against their own countrymen; on both occasions our Government, after loudly proclaiming the valour and endurance displayed by our soldiers, resolved on permanently holding the country. Let us hope that the similarity will not extend further; for in the case of Kabul onerous and humiliating conditions had to be submitted to before our troops could leave that city in August 1880. We renounced the fine imposed on the city for the murder of our envoy within its walls; we refunded the treasure seized by us; we paid a million of rupees to the Amír; we surrendered some thirty guns and we refrained, at the bidding of the Amír, from destroying the defensive works we had constructed round Kabul. Sir Lepel Griffin, who was an eye-witness and a principal agent in the affair, says in the *Nineteenth Century* for June:—"England has never known how nearly our Kabul force was lost and overwhelmed. It took twenty millions to bring it back, and in those days the Afghan army was armed, not like the Afridis are now with rifles, but with knives and matchlocks."

The *Times*, in an article published on the 15th June, once more advocates the retention of Chitral and the construction of a road across the Swat and Boneir territories, saying: "Our soldiers have done their work; it is now for our statesmen to see that we reap the full benefit of their valour and skill." This, as an argument in favour of the above policy, however, does not apply to the present case; seeing that the work of our soldiers was to rescue Dr. Robertson, while the permanent occupation of Chitral constitutes a vast undertaking, involving new responsibilities and requiring new resources in men and money. It is, in short, a scheme much too extensive and expensive to be entered on as an afterthought, and without full enquiry and mature consideration.

The inspiriting picture of the recent campaign presented in the *Times* is obviously imperfect, inasmuch as it omits a material feature of that campaign, namely, the powerful co-operation we received at the hands of the Khan of Dir, and the other chiefs who aided us in the rescue of our agent. It would be misleading, therefore, to look upon the success of that campaign as affording an earnest or a pledge of success for the campaign now suggested; unless, at all events, we secure, for the new undertaking, the fidelity of tribal chiefs equally powerful and who would, moreover, be willing to co-operate in the destruction of the ancient independence of their country. To believe that such fidelity and co-operation might be secured by diplomacy, promises and subsidies, would betray fatal ignorance of the Afghan character, of the nature of the country, and of its traditional laws and customs.

A solemn oath binds all Afghan tribesmen, when summoned by their priests, to join in expelling or exterminating *Káfars* (infidels) who may invade their territory; and they are likewise bound to put to death any of their leaders who may venture to jeopardise the independence of tribal territory. Of the latter ordeal we had an illustration last year in the persons of certain Waziri *máliks* (headmen) who accepted from us the mission of persuading their fellow-tribesmen to submit to British rule, and who forfeited their lives in consequence, when they returned from conferring with our political agent.

A feeling of solidarity cements the Afghan tribes in the defence of tribal territory, and strong hostility is excited in every tribe against the infidel power that threatens any part of such territory. Accordingly, the *Pioneer* of May 30th observes: "Whenever our troops are engaged across the North-West frontier, there are *ghazi* outrages on the borderland. This has been the case during the Chitral campaign.

A British soldier was badly wounded at Peshawur; Lieutenant Limond was killed in the Tochi valley, and there were further outrages of the same kind in the latter neighbourhood. Jamrud fort (at the mouth of the Khyber) was fired into the other night."

Have we, moreover, forgotten how Padsha Khan, whom we so liberally subsidised in the Afghan war, collected his men and attacked our troops in December, 1879, and again at Charasiâb in April, 1880, when we most needed his aid? Other instances also testified, in that unfortunate war, the worthlessness of subsidies and bribes, as means of achieving conquest in Afghanistan; and the Government of India, by systematically resorting to such means in the pursuit of its "forward policy," lowers the nation in the eyes of the world, and has raised hopes which have invariably proved delusive and, on certain occasions, have led to great humiliation and disasters.

J. DACOSTA.

THE INDIA OF THE VEDA.[1]

BY PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

The subject of this most interesting volume of "The Story of the Nations" series is overcast and permeated with the glamour and curiousness both of antiquity and of tentative indagations into the nature of the universe and the relations of man. The author very properly sets out with a suggestive sketch of "the wonderland of the East," confining the picture, however, mainly to Hindustan proper or India north of the Vindhya range of mountains. For "the beginnings of political and social life and the spiritual development in religion and philosophy, that are to be our theme, were perfected almost entirely within the northern half" of the country. The spiritual, no less than the physical, influences of the overshadowing Himalayas, with the issuing rivers, and the distinctive products of the soil, needed to be impressed in order to a just exposition of the governing ideas of the Vedic times. It is necessary also to say something of "the Aryas." The author invokes the aid of philology at the point where history fails, and presents a general view of the best conclusions of acknowledged authorities. The picture is largely vague, and might well have been left in a wider indefiniteness; for philology is an instrument of manifold imperfections, as well as of seductive charm. For the safe use of it there is required a firmly restrained caution, which is but too apt to be overborne by the mirage of eager fancy. We are gratified to observe that the author declines to fix "the primeval home" of the Aryas. From time to time there occur expressions of certainty regarding institutions or beliefs of the pre-Vedic periods. Of course, the principle of evolution must be frankly recognised, and sidelights are available for Indo-Eranian times; but on the whole, it will be prudent to hold convictions in suspense with regard to earlier conditions. The points of doubt are too numerous, and the evidence is too complicated and special, for any adequate treatment on such an occasion as the present.

There is perennial interest in the opening up of "the sources of our knowledge" of the earliest literature of India, and our author describes in appreciative terms the labours of Sir William Jones, Colebrooke, and Wilkins. The body of the work, as well as the list of illustrative books, also indicates a competent acquaintance with the studies of later investigators. The sketch of Vedic Literature, though concise, is lucid and sufficient for the purpose in hand. The author's summary view is as follows:

> "In a wider sense, all the literature of India may, theoretically, be said to come under that head, since the Veda—the Rig-Veda in the last instance—pervades and dominates her spiritual life, even as her own Himâlaya sways and regulates the conditions of her material existence. But the special and distinctive Vedic literature is that which follows directly from the Veda and revolves around it, treating only of such matters as it either contains or suggests. It naturally falls into three very obvious main divisions: (1) the Mantra period—the period of collecting the songs with no special object beyond that of preserving them; (2) the Brâhmana period—the period of commentary and a certain amount of exegesis, with the patent object of establishing the supremacy of the Brâhman caste; (3) the Sûtra period—the period of concise special treatises for practical use at school and sacrifice. Chronologically, these periods do not strictly succeed one another, any more than the so-called culture ages—of stone, of brass, of iron—but overlap both ways over and over. Thus, if the second period corresponds to a well-defined stage of the Aryas' conquest of India—that of their advance eastward and their establishment in the valleys of the Gangâ and Yamunâ—the third may be said to struggle down actually into modern times, since the monumental commentary on the Rig-Veda, the Brâhmans', standard authority, was written by Sâyana as late as the fourteenth century of our era."

The original mantras (hymns, sacred texts) collected in the Rig-Veda itself—"the oldest book of the Aryan family of nations"—may be dated between 1500 and 1000 B.C., or even in parts earlier, though the oldest known manuscripts do not date much before 1500 A.D. At the earliest and unalloyed stage of the mantras, "the religion which we see faithfully mirrored in them is *naturalism*, pure and simple, *i.e.*, the worship of the Powers of Nature as Beings." "The older Gods"—Dyâus, Váruna, Mitra, Agni, Soma, Yama, Vâyu—"whom we can trace with absolute certainty to an Indo-Eranian past and identify with corresponding divine beings in the Avesta," are successively dealt with. Then follows the Storm Myth of Indra, at once Storm-god and War-god (who is supposed to be evolved from Parjanya, the Storm-god, pure and simple), with his companions in battle, the warlike Maruts (or Storm-winds); and, in connexion with this, the Sun-and-Dawn Myth of Sûrya and Ushas, with the twin Ashvins and the friendly Pûshan. Next come "the Lesser and Later Gods," with personifications not properly entitled to godhead, but regarded with extreme reverence, such as waters and rivers, Vâch (speech) and Aranyâni (forest).

The Rig-Veda, though not directly historical, supplies a considerable amount of material for an historical reconstruction. The author briefly examines the original caste system, in order to found a basis for the conclusion that "castes, as a firmly established institution, were not as yet a feature of the Vedic period." The division, however, of the peoples of the Penjâb and (later) of the more easterly portion of Hindustân into the two main classes of Aryas and Dasyus, recurs throughout the collection; and this leads to some account of the main stocks of the Dasyus, the Kolarians and the Dravidians, which we recently found treated in great amplitude by Mr. J. F. Hewitt. In the exceptionally sacred verse called Gâyatrî "we come on the thin end of a wedge, which, being inserted at this early time, sprung a cleft which runs through the entire epic and religious life of India—the schism between the two Brâhmanic schools which have their names from the two—probably real—Vedic Rishis, Vasishtha and Vishvâmitra." The story of the conflict engineered by these hostile Rishis, a conflict between the advancing Aryans and a confederacy of ten tribes formed to check them, is carefully reconstructed from the Rig-Veda. The story of the Flood in India, as set forth here, should be read in connexion with the account of the Deluge in "The Story of Chaldea."

---

[1] "Vedic India; as embodied principally in the Rig-Veda." By Zénaide A. Ragozin. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

There are points of deep interest in the chapter on "Early Culture." The treatment of the dead is described, and the idea of immortality is admitted, although we should have liked a more emphatic limitation of it to the latest Vedic times.

> "The hope, the faith, are very firm and definite." But "*what* is this future life? What are its conditions, its occupations? Vague imaginings only give answer. . . . . The one belief of a materialistic character which is positively expressed and insisted on is that in a resurrection in the flesh, even while the body is supposed to be disintegrated and resolved into its elementary component parts. . . . . one thing appears certain: that the 'new body' with which the departed was to 'clothe himself' must have been imagined as a glorified, probably an unsubstantial, one. . . . . The most definite impression we receive, however, is that of a floating, a hovering, in infinite space, in a flood, a sea of light."

So much for "the God-fearing." For the rest, "in conformity with Aryan dualism, if the good live in eternal light, the wicked must be consigned to darkness everlasting, and that is about all." In the Atharva-Veda, however, we are "confronted by a thoroughly materialistic paradise and hell," and are "informed exactly of the pleasures which await the blessed dead and the torments which the wicked dead suffer." The domestic life on earth, and the treatment of women, afford a still keener test of the ethical culture of the times. On these points there is but scanty direct evidence in the Rig-Veda; "but it is quite sufficient to show that the position held by the Aryan woman in Vedic Penjâb was a most honourable, nay, exalted one, which later influences and developments changed by no means for the better, but rather, and very much, for the worse."

> "Nor is only the later dire doom of widows meant by this—unknown, as we have seen, to the early Aryas—but also, and even chiefly, the woman's home life, as wife and mother. She appears to have been on a footing of perfect equality with her husband, subject absolutely to no one in his house, not even to his parents, let alone his brothers and sisters. What is more, she was a *willing* bride; and, though it was customary to make the official demand through third persons, it is more than probable that her consent was made sure of first, and indeed that she was frequently awarded the privilege of choosing out of many suitors. This fine old Aryan custom endured far into the classical Brâhmanic period. . . . . In her father's house the Aryan maiden enjoyed the usual shelter and cherishing, and her brothers were her born champions and protectors."

The vices of drinking and gambling are already, in these early days, but too familiar. A special chapter is devoted to sacrifice, on which the author adopts the conclusion of M. Abel Bergaigne, that it is "an imitation of the chief phenomena of the sky and the atmosphere"—a sort of beneficent conjuring. Human sacrifice is not expressly mentioned in the Rig-Veda; but "we cannot exonerate our Aryan ancestors from the blot which appears to rest on all races—that of having, at some time, practised the abomination of human sacrifices." The final chapter sums up the Cosmogony and the Philosophy of the Rig-Veda. As to the first:

> "When it comes to details, three distinct conceptions crystallise out of hundreds of texts bearing on the subject: (1) The gods *built* the world, carpenter-fashion, as the Aryas built their houses; (2) the gods—this or that couple, especially Heaven and Earth or the gods generally—*gave birth* to the world, after the manner of living beings; (3) the world was created through Sacrifice, as by Sacrifice it is kept going. The first of these conceptions may be classed almost entirely under poetical imagery; the second in great part, with an evident but rather clumsy flight into symbolism; while the third, purely theological, soars into almost unattainable regions of abstruse mysticism. Although the progression from simple to complicated is manifest, and such a progression implies progress and evolution, implying in their turn a vast period of time, it does not follow that the transition from step to step can be followed, much less chronologically classified."

"The whole naturalism of the Rig-Veda," our author concludes, "its entire conception of the universe and its working, hinges on two sets of natural phenomena: those of Light (Heat is included, though not specially mentioned till late) and of Moisture, embodied in Agni and Soma."

> "The mysticism of the Rig-Veda has its source: 1st, in the connection of Agni—as Brithaspati or Brahmanaspati—with the two great acts of worship, prayer and sacrifice; 2nd, in the belief in a supernal, hidden world, the source of light, and the 'highest abode' of all divine beings; 3rd, in the kinship men claim with Agni, and owing to which that world is their 'home, which cannot be taken from them,' to which they are 'restored' when they leave this world by 'the path of death' by which the Ancient Fathers preceded them, whom they go to join in that Abode of Light. . . .
>
> "As religious mysticism develops into philosophical speculation, the same principle of Light-and-Heat in union with Moisture (the Waters) as the factor of Creation and the Supporter of the Worlds still holds good. . . .
>
> "Agni, then—Light-and-Heat—is the Divine pre-existing and self-existing One, who (when manifested) fills and pervades the world, abides in and contains all things.
>
> "In this way, in this sense, were the Aryas of India Fire-Worshippers. In this way, after repeatedly reaching out for Monotheism, they missed it at last and found instead Pantheism, which they held fast.
>
> "And thus the transition from pure nature-worship to the transcendental metaphysical mysticism of Brahmanism is effected gradually, smoothly, within the Rig-Veda itself."

The style of the volume tends to turgidity, with too frequent looseness of texture; but the author has presented a substantial account of the main elements of the very complicated subject in an orderly and perspicuous exposition. As a popular first-book on the India of the Veda, it will be found attractive and stimulating. The pruning of extravagant optimism, the rectification of venturous speculation, and the filling out of the exposition—all of which processes occasionally seem to be called for—may well be left to further studies of the reader in the same department. A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

THE INDIAN PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE AND THE INDIAN BUDGET.

LETTER TO MR. FOWLER.

The following letter has been addressed to Mr. Fowler, together with the Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, which forms a special Supplement to the present number of India :—

To The Right Honourable H. H. Fowler, M.P., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, India Office, S.W.

Sir,—On behalf of the Indian Parliamentary Committee I had the honour, on the 6th of July last, to address to you a letter on the subject of Indian finance, forwarding a detailed Note (now referred to as No. 1) upon Mr. (now Sir James) Westland's Budget of 1894-5. In that letter it was stated that, from an examination of the facts, the Committee had formed the following conclusions : (1) that the Government of India was in error in maintaining that exchange was the sole, or even the principal cause of the existing deficit; and (2) that the true cause of Indian financial difficulties was the overgrowth of military and civil expenditure.

2. In now forwarding herewith Note No. 2, on the Budget of 1895-6, the Committee feel it their duty to repeat and confirm the conclusions above recorded; and further to state that in their opinion recent events beyond the North-West Frontier, and the expense incurred in the Chitral expedition, make it clear that Indian finances cannot be placed on a sound basis so long as a frontier policy is pursued leading to such costly military operations.

3. Before referring to the figures for 1895-6 the Committee desire briefly to notice certain objections taken in the Viceroy's Council to the conclusions arrived at in Note No. 1. Speaking in the Budget debate, on the 28th of March last, Sir James Westland complained that in calculating the total loss by exchange we had not included the loss arising from the sterling payments to British soldiers. This was doubtless an important omission, and the correction will make a difference of about Rx. 750,000 in the total of the actual loss by exchange. But when this error has been corrected we do not find that the general conclusions of the Committee are materially affected. The total net increase of Military and Civil expenditure from 1883-4 to 1893-4, as shown in Note No. 1, was Rx. 8,854,346, the corresponding loss by exchange being Rx. 3,322,786. If Rx. 750,000 on account of British soldiers' sterling pay be transferred from the former to the latter total, there will still be left Rx. 8,104,346 net Military and Civil Expenditure, as against Rx. 4,072,786 loss by exchange; and this shows that out of the increased charge the portion arising from net Military and Civil expenditure is about double that caused by loss in exchange. Speaking, in somewhat forcible terms, of the error which has now been corrected, Sir James Westland calls it a "gigantic blunder." But he should bear in mind that in this matter we went astray by following the form in which the accounts of the Government of India are presented to Parliament. Moreover, in 1889, Sir James Westland himself produced in the Viceroy's Council a Table ("Financial Statement of the Government of India for 1888-9," p. 8) purporting to separate the exchange figures, and to show what the net expenditure would have been if there had been no alteration in exchange. In this Table the charge arising out of the sterling payments to the British soldier is not shown as loss by exchange. If therefore our omission constituted a serious mistake, it was one for which as Finance Minister he was himself in great measure responsible. Another item which he claims to include as loss by exchange is the exchange compensation granted to the services in 1893. But this claim is inadmissible, as the loss by exchange now in controversy represents the loss only so far as it is automatic and unavoidable, and should not include any expenditure, such as exchange compensation, separately and voluntarily incurred by the Government, even although the reason for incurring such expenditure may have been the loss suffered by individuals owing to the unfavourable exchange. If, however, exchange compensation were also included, as he desires, it would go but a little way (*vide* Note No. 2, para. 17) towards proving that loss by exchange is the sole cause of our embarrassments.

4. We now come to the figures of 1895-6; and in tracing the causes of the increased expenditure in recent years we have to consider what period should be selected for purposes of comparison. Sir James Westland desires to go back only seven years, to 1888-9. But that does not seem to be a fair period to take, excluding as it would, the large increase of military expenditure which was initiated just before 1888. In Note No. 1 we preferred to take a period of ten years, going back to the average of the years 1882-3 to 1884-5; and we still regard those years as a good starting point, because at that time the old standard of military expenditure still prevailed, and because, under the viceroyalty of Lord Ripon, and with Sir Evelyn Baring as Finance Minister, financial equilibrium then existed. But even taking the accounts of 1888-9 as a starting point, and comparing them with the Budget Estimate of 1895-6, the conclusions of this Committee will still be found to hold good. For Table III at para. 19 of Note No. 2, shows that during the seven years referred to the expenditure on the Military and Civil Services alone increased by Rx. 5,429,034, apart from any increase due to exchange. To this amount ought to be added the Rx. 848,769 due to loss by exchange on the increased sterling charges, an increase within the control of the Government of India; so that the total increased expenditure on the Services amounts to Rx. 6,277,803, while Rx. 4,195,628 represents loss by exchange. But in this calculation the sum of Rx. 1,307,200 on account of exchange compensation has (by way of illustration) been added to the latter instead of the former total. And it has already been shown that, for the purposes of the present argument, this charge cannot properly be included in loss by exchange, which purports to represent only automatic and unavoidable loss. With this correction, therefore, the real totals are Rx. 7,585,003, and Rx. 2,888,428, respectively. And these figures appear conclusively to prove that Sir J. Westland has altogether misapprehended the financial situation when he asserts

that the increased charge arising since 1888 is "due to exchange and to exchange alone."

5. The impossible conclusions into which the Indian Finance Minister has been betrayed in his endeavour to maintain an untenable position are illustrated by the Statement of Account which, during the Budget debate, he gravely presented to the Viceroy's Council as evidence that both income and expenditure have decreased since 1883-4. In that statement he converts the total net income and expenditure of India from rupees into pounds sterling; and as exchange has during the period in question fallen about 33 per cent., the natural result of this operation is to show that, stated in pounds sterling, both income and expenditure are less now than they were in 1883-4. But it is difficult to believe that he is serious when he argues from this result that the Government has practised most marvellous economy, and that the burden upon the Indian taxpayer, who pays all his taxes in rupees, has been materially lightened. A similar process of reasoning if applied to Imperial finance (*vide* Note No. 2, para. 10) would prove that our National Debt, instead of having been reduced by 80 millions, has been increased by over 100 millions, during the last ten years. Those interested in Indian finance naturally look to the Finance Minister, when bringing in the Budget, to occupy a position of scientific impartiality, and to place before the public a lucid and popular exposition of the facts. It becomes therefore a ground of grave complaint if instead of doing this, he deals in financial paradoxes, and imports additional confusion into a subject already intricate and obscure.

6. In conclusion, I am requested to refer to the Budget debate last year in the House of Commons. On that occasion this Committee observed with regret that you did not deem it necessary to furnish a definite reply to the contentions put forward by them in the interest of the Indian taxpayer. It is not presumed that the omission proceeded from intentional disrespect towards the large body of Members of Parliament by whom the representation was formally submitted to you. But a reference to the official report will show that this is the interpretation publicly placed upon the action of the Secretary of State by the Indian Finance Minister when speaking in the Viceroy's Council on the 28th of March last. The Committee also observe with surprise that Sir J. Westland at the same time permitted himself to refer to their representation in a tone of discourtesy[1] which seemed uncalled for, and peculiarly unsuited to the occasion. As regards the present communication I have the honour, on behalf of the Committee, to bespeak for it careful consideration on the part of Her Majesty's Government and to express a hope that when the Indian Revenue Accounts are brought before the House of Commons, the Committee may be favoured with a judgment on the points at issue between themselves and the Government of India.

7. Doubtless the Government of India will be able to show certain reasons for every increase of expenditure; it is probable that with regard to some of the items they will be able to show a supreme necessity; but the advisability of an increase here or the necessity of an increase there is not the question at issue. It may be admitted at once that a certain amount of increased expenditure by the Government of India in certain departments is not only necessary, but desirable in the interests of good government. The real point, however, is that the Government of India have not been content with a moderate increase of expenditure, but have continued, with insufficient regard for the capacity of the people to bear existing burdens, to increase expenditure on the Civil and Military Services at a rate which under all the circumstances is not justifiable nor compatible with the safety and prosperity of the Empire.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
(Signed) W. WEDDERBURN.
Chairman, Indian Parliamentary Committee.

House of Commons,
24th June, 1895.

CHITRAL AND THE "FORWARD" POLICY.

The *Manchester Guardian*, commenting on the visit of his highness Nasrulla Khan to Manchester, wrote:—To some of us whose recollections go back some distance into the past this visit from an Afghan Prince cannot but be suggestive of events which happened years ago. The retrospect is not wholly gratifying. We are reminded of things which if we could we would willingly forget, and of memorable incidents which throw a melancholy shade upon some pages of our national history. The root of the misfortunes and disasters which we have experienced in connection with Afghanistan has been the supposed necessity of interfering in the internal affairs of the country. It was, no doubt, of great importance that the ruler of Afghanistan should be on friendly terms with us, but, instead of seeing that the likeliest way of securing this great object was to show a scrupulous desire to respect the independence of the country and to refrain alike from every infringement of its territories and from all intermeddling in its domestic affairs, we imagined that the best plan was out of a number of claimants to make our choice of the one who pleased us best, and to set him on the throne. This we could only do by force of arms. We had to invade the country and conduct our princely client to Kabul. But the mere fact that he was imposed upon the country by a foreign Power was quite enough to arouse the indignant patriotism of the warlike tribes and to ensure his fall. We did our utmost fifty or sixty years to defeat the claims of Dost Mahommed, the great-grandfather of our present visitor, and to force upon the Afghans the candidate whom we preferred; but the attempt ended in an ignominious failure, illustrated for all time by a signal catastrophe. History records how, of an army which set out but from Kabul on a retreat which had become inevitable, only a single person escaped to carry the tidings to the nearest British garrison. Of course we traversed the country afresh and put down all resistance, but it was only to recognise the utter folly of what we had tried to do, and to leave the great chieftain who had been the life and soul of the opposition to our schemes in quiet possession of the throne. But a time came when the wisdom which experience should have taught us was forgotten. The hostile policy which Mr. Disraeli adopted as regards Russia led to some diplomatic incidents at Kabul which were seized upon as a pretext for aggression. Demands were made with which it was known that the Afghan ruler could not comply, and then we invaded his territories for the purpose of extorting from him a new boundary line, which we were pleased to call, in Mr. Disraeli's jargon, "a scientific frontier." Again we made a victorious march, we defeated the Amír, and set up a new one in his stead. Then came a massacre which we were bound to avenge. We deposed the new Amír, and then, in sheer embarrassment, had to make overtures to Abdur Ráhman Khan, the present Amír, who had been living for years under Russian protection, and whom till then we had held in great suspicion. The "scientific frontier" ended in smoke. We had spent many millions of money on the enterprise, and at last were glad to get away after having accomplished literally nothing. We have lived since then on tolerably good terms with the Amír. We have made a treaty with him, giving guarantees which, should an occasion ever arise for enforcing them, we shall certainly find much difficulty in making good. Our defensive approaches in the direction of Kandahar have more than once aroused his suspicions and led to grave remonstrances, but the difficulty seems to have been overcome. Of course the Indian Government pays the Amír a handsome subsidy, and this arrangement has a certain pacifying force. Afghanistan is now a "buffer State" interposed between our Indian territories and Russia.

---

[1] He stated that the Secretary of State had "passed the whole thing over with the contempt it deserved."

It might be thought that our Afghan experiences had taught us the impolicy of basing our policy of frontier defence upon interference with the independence of the tribal communities on our borders. Yet at this very time, in sheer forgetfulness of past lessons, we are repeating at Chitral the blunders we formerly committed at Kabul. The clans who live in the valleys between our extreme northern frontier and the wastes of the Pamirs are warlike and strongly organised. Often quarrelling among themselves, they unite at once in resisting aggression. These wild races have never yet been in subjection to any superior power. Their mountains are their citadels, and their passion is to be free. Yet the project which finds support with the ruling military caste at Calcutta and Simla is to subjugate these people, to extend our authority over them, and to carry our "protected" territory up to the verge of that which is claimed by Russia. Here the theory of a "buffer" State seems to disappear. Nothing will satisfy us but to come within fighting distance of the rival Power which we always have in view. The intermediary tribes are to be vanquished and broken up and taught submission, the very lesson, one would imagine, which we ought to refrain from teaching them. The best and sufficient security of our frontier in that direction is found in the difficulties which nature throws in the way of an invader. The so-called passes are all but impassable. The mountain ranges send their spurs into the valleys, commanding every track by which troops can advance, while the defiles are blocked up with snow. The impracticable character of the country has been sufficiently shown by the almost insuperable obstacles with which the recent expeditions had to contend. It would seem that the best defensive arrangement we could make would be to leave things as they are. Instead of this, it is proposed to make an excellent road to Chitral, one along which our troops can pass and repass and be well provisioned at all seasons. In other words, at an immense delay we are proposing to remove the difficulties which nature has thrown like a vast rampart beyond our frontier, and to construct roads which would be as useful to an invader as they can ever be to ourselves. It is surely high time to abandon this absurd and mischievous policy and all that belongs to it. The military expedition to Chitral has cost the impoverished taxpayers of India two millions of money, and if the plans suggested in connexion with it are carried into effect the expenditure must be continued on a very large scale. It is time to reflect upon the prior obligations which we owe to the people of India. It is quite possible that they may not share in the excessive anxieties which are shown by the military authorities, and would much prefer that we trusted them a little more and taxed them a little less. A contented India is the best guarantee we could have for the loyalty of the people and the permanence of our rule. In the possession of that great dependency, with a population approaching to three hundred millions, we have a larger responsibility, a wider sphere of usefulness, a grander opportunity for advancing the civilisation of the world than have ever been thrown into the hands of any nation. In the light of our duties to the people of India and of the enduring results which it may be within our power to attain, all the aims of vulgar ambition, all the attractions of territorial aggrandisement, fade away. It is for us to realise what we may worthily deem our mission and strenuously labour to fulfil it. If the visit of the Afghan Prince should help to fasten such reflections on our minds and contribute in any measure to the forming of such resolutions as the task which is laid upon us demands, we shall have additional reasons for recalling it with satisfaction, and the results will be memorable.

The *Times* of June 10th printed a letter from General Sir Neville Chamberlain in reply to a leading article which appeared in the *Times* of May 31st, in support of the policy of occupying Chitral. We take the following from Sir N. Chamberlain's important letter:—

> First, as regards the strategical value of the position of Chitral as a means of checking invasion from the north.
>
> The advocates of the retention of this post at any cost base their demand upon the existence of the Baroghil and Dorah Passes, as also upon the circumstance that the Russian frontier line has of late years been geographically advanced to within twelve

miles of the borderland of Chitral. With this statement the argument as regards the facility of access from the north ends—for nothing is said as to the nature of the country that intervenes between the passes and the positions now occupied, or suitable for occupation, by Russian troops, and from which an advancing force must move to reach Chitral. It is, however, accepted as a well-established fact that this dividing distance is a network of barren mountains and small valleys, practically devoid of population or cultivation, and is only to be traversed at certain seasons of the year, consequent upon the rigour of the climate and the absence of forage for animals.

In proof of the opinion now held at army headquarters in India as to the physical obstacles of this highly-elevated region, and the difficulty that they must present to its being used as a base of operations for invasion, I have only to draw the attention of your readers to a paragraph in the same number of your journal[1] as that which contained the leading article to which my letter is a reply. In that paragraph information is given as to the arrangements made for the journey of the Commission appointed by the Government of India to assist in the demarcation of the Pamir border, in conjunction with representatives to be sent by the Governments of Russia and Kabul. Our Commission of five British officers is to advance by Chitral, and is to cross the Baroghil Pass; and it is stated that only ten native soldiers are to accompany the party, so that the transport and the difficulty of obtaining supplies may be reduced to a *minimum*.

It is true that small Russian outposts have been located in more advanced positions than was formerly the case, and that conflict has taken place between these detachments and the Amír's outposts on the grounds that the Afghans had trespassed on Russian soil. It is these little conflicts which have given rise to nervous anxiety at Simla; and, considering the generally unfriendly tone displayed in the English Press as to the expansion of Russia in Central Asia, there is probably little desire on the part of Russian officers to lessen the existing irritation. The old saying that one man may steal a horse whilst another may not look over the hedge is not altogether inapplicable to the region where three Empires meet.

Next, as to the danger which is anticipated should our garrison be withdrawn from Chitral. It is conjectured that a "diversion" may then be made on that place by a Russian detachment, to be shortly followed by three or four thousand more troops, who will thus be placed in the position of being able to command the three roads leading north, south, and east, by which they may at pleasure have access to either Kashmir, Jelalabad, or Peshawur. My reply to this suggestion is that the forecast is so extremely improbable, if not impracticable, as to call for no serious consideration. A sure and continuous supply of food is a first requisite for the advance of any body of troops. If that provision be not forthcoming the invading force could neither remain in Chitral nor could it advance; and in that case whence are they to obtain this first of necessities? The surrounding valleys could not produce them. It is the want of a sufficiency of food for the inhabitants that tends to drive these people into acts of violence against their neighbours and into going further afield as highway robbers.

The operations now taking place beyond the Peshawur border are the latest evidence of the difficulties attendant upon the feeding of troops employed in such regions. The force under General Low has its base at Peshawur. That place is the terminus of a railway in connection with the whole railway system of India, and the resources of all India as regards transport and supplies are at the disposal of a well-organized military commissariat department. With all these advantages, and after only one occasion of serious resistance on the part of the tribesmen, the advance of General Low's leading brigade was retarded consequent upon an insufficient flow of supplies to the front. Only a wing of infantry could, in the first instance, be pushed forward into Chitral; and this was all that could be done when it was desirable to have made an imposing demonstration on entering that place. Even Colonel Kelly was delayed in leading his gallant band back to Mastuj until arrangements could be made for feeding them.

In times of profound quiet, the victualling from Kashmir of the outposts at Hunza and Gilghit is an instance of the arrangements involved in such a matter. It is a business of some weeks, and requires the employment of numerous mules and hundreds of porters. But for forced labour and the fear of severe punishment for default I question if the operation could be carried out except at enormous cost. With the best exertions on the part of the British officers to prevent the native officials from tyrannizing over those employed under them in the transport, the suffering involved to man and beast must be great. England is so far responsible for what thus takes place, as it was under the orders of the Government of India that these places were occupied by British officers and troops, with the sole purpose of preventing possible future Russian aggression from the direction of the Pamirs.

I think I have said enough to disarm fear from most minds as to a possible diversion by way of Chitral towards Peshawur and Kashmir. It only remains to consider the route from Chitral to Jelalabad through Asmar, which is, in fact, the one assumed to be most likely to be taken by an invading force. I will suppose that the invaders bring with them a sufficiency of supplies to enable them to reach Jelalabad; there hemmed in they may be left to be disposed of by the Afghan and the numerous surrounding tribesmen.

Three reasons are assigned in the *Times* against the possibility of withdrawal, viz.:—1. Our duty to the Empire. 2. Our duty to prevent the hostile tribesmen from cherishing the idea of unlimited murder. 3. Our duty to our allies in the campaign.

I am unable to recognize the soundness of the reason assigned in No. 1. I hold to the very opposite opinion. As regards No. 2, I can see no call to remain in order that we may forcibly introduce a higher standard of morality. It could only be done at considerable future risk and large additional outlay, and in addition to this would probably lead us on to a new series of difficulties with the Amír and people of Afghanistan; for in that neighbourhood the relations and politics of the adjacent tribes are so interwoven as to make it impossible to draw a distinct line of separation which would be equally agreeable to the views held at Simla and at Kabul. England is in no way responsible for the state of society which has existed in Chitral and amongst the neighbouring tribesmen for generations; whilst to introduce our penal code into those distant localities would certainly add one more difficulty to those that already exist, by driving the people to abhor the English name and every English interest. If retention of Chitral is to prevail on the strength of claim No. 2 then the English people are bound to undertake the Quixotic enterprise of redressing every evil with which its Eastern policy brings it into contact. Let English gold extracted from English pockets do the work. It would be injustice to require the Hindus and Mahomedans of India to provide the means for an object in which they have no interest, and to which they are in fact opposed.

---

[1] The paragraph here referred to appeared in the *Times* of May 30th.

As regards No. 3, I admit that it carries with it a moral obligation, though it must be taken for granted that neither the Khan of Dir nor any of his followers took up arms on our behalf from any devotion to the British cause. They acted from self-interest and in order to retaliate upon Umra Khan, who had injured them, and they were ready to take advantage of any opportunity which might have presented itself for wreaking their vengeance. Unfortunately, and to our discredit, we have had on two occasions when withdrawing from Afghanistan to leave behind us some who had befriended our cause. We were drawn into these dilemmas by the forward policy, and, now again, the problem has to be faced.

The frontier policy advocated by Herbert Edwardes, John Lawrence and others—and carried out by Lord Lawrence as Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, and subsequently as Viceroy—was intelligible and consistent. It was based upon the principle of maintaining friendly relations with the Amír of Kabul and the Afghan people, as also with all the independent tribesmen along the Indus border. It must be understood that it was at that time well recognized that peace with these people could not be looked for except on the condition of their being allowed to retain their independence, for it was clear that on no other basis could a friendly feeling exist between these tribes and the Government of India.

How can it now be reconcilable to give annually to the Amír £180,000 in order to secure his friendship and to enable him to increase the efficiency of his forces, and at the same time expend millions in harrying, fighting with, and making permanent enemies of the independent tribesmen? For continued internal and external peace, both Afghans and frontier men must be made to feel secure in their independence; and this can only be brought about, and be relied upon, by a rigid rejection by the Government of England of the policy which has been inaugurated within the last few years, and is being constantly developed by the Progressive party.

The *Spectator* wrote on June 8th:—We should not discuss the matter again just now, but that there are two arguments of high importance which we wish to bring before politicians, and which have been, in the Press at all events, unaccountably neglected. One, and perhaps the stronger, is that if we keep Chitral, that is, we repeat, if we assume the general suzerainty of all Pathanistan, we abandon a great policy hitherto accepted by the Cabinets of both parties, and acted upon by the Government of India. That policy is to keep a buffer-State alive between our Empire in Asia and that of the Czar. This idea, whether sound or unsound, has received the support of all Indian statesmen and most Indian generals for at least twenty years past, regulates our every action in Afghanistan, including the payment of £160,000 a year to the Amír, and dictates at this moment the unusual honours which we are paying to the Afghan Shahzada, Nasirullah Khan. If we take Chitral that policy is discarded; for thenceforward our frontiers march with those of Russia. The Russians, that is, can, whenever convenient, without warning and without having to march twenty miles out of their own territory, drag the British Army from its base to defend the slopes of the Hindu Kush from a rush which, even if it is only a feint, must, nevertheless, be driven back by bayonets and shells. This liability, serious in any case, is doubly serious because Russia is a Power which would not hesitate, if for any reason she wished to occupy our Army, to sacrifice twenty thousand soldiers and auxiliaries in doing it, knowing well that if her invading columns were defeated, they could not be pursued. The road from Peshawur to Chitral once made, the Czar could send a corps d'armée down it without crossing any intermediate territory; and we must defend it as we should defend Cornwall, or face the consequences that would follow a telegram announcing to India and the world that a Russian army had appeared at Peshawur. It may be wise to encounter that risk, or unavoidable—we are not discussing that—but clearly, if we encounter it, we are abandoning the policy of creating a buffer-State, which we have spent so much money and so many lives in maintaining hitherto. So clear is this, that if the change is accomplished, one of the best arguments against the favourite Russian scheme of the partition of Afghanistan will be gone, and the next Amír may well live in dread for his independence. We shall have rolled up at last to the Russian frontier, though only at a point; and our lateral extension east and west will be dictated of necessity mainly by military considerations, which, so far as we see, always compel us to guard our flanks by planting new outposts to the right and left. We are not military experts, and allow at once that this may be the wise course; but we are entitled to say that it is *not* the course hitherto dignified with the title of the "Indian frontier policy."

The second argument, hitherto undiscussed, or discussed but carelessly, is that we must not on this occasion pay too much deference to the opinion of the Indian Government. The retention of Chitral is not a purely Indian question. It is an English question of the first importance. . . . . It is only because of our relations with Russia that the question of Afghanistan, or the question of Pathanistan, or the question of the Indian northern frontier, has any grave importance. And our relations with Russia must be managed by the Cabinet, which, if there is any collision, will have to provide the fleets, the troops, and the treasure demanded by the struggle. We cannot fight Nicholas II. in India alone as our grandsires fought Louis XV. in India alone, but must meet him in Europe, in the Caucasus, and in the Farthest East as well as in India. The responsibility for that terrible struggle, therefore, must rest with the Imperial Government; and to say that it shall not control acts which may bring such a struggle on, is to introduce administrative anarchy. It must control them, or fail in its duty; and as responsibility implies power, the right of deciding finally must remain with the Parliamentary Secretary, —that is, ultimately with the Cabinet as a whole. This seems to us to be merely a constitutional proposition wholly beyond reply; and if it is so, the announcement that the Government of India has formed a final opinion loses much of its meaning. No Secretary of State for India is fit for his place who does not give to the advice of that Government its fullest value, or who does not regret heartily an occasion for overriding it; but neither does a Secretary of State, who, on an Imperial question, treats that advice as an order, which he can only obey and defend, understand his responsibilities.

We shall not repeat to-day the old arguments which have convinced us . . . . that the attempt to extend British authority over Pathanistan is unwise; but the special correspondent of the *Times* at Chitral supplies us with a new one. It is quite clear from his fascinating letters, which, while minutely accurate, read more like a story by Mr. Stanley Weyman than a narrative of actual adventure, that he is inclined to favour the policy of retaining Chitral; but it is quite clear also that the conquest of Pathanistan will involve effort of no mean order. The Pathan tribes have advanced a half a century in the art of war since we last encountered them in the field. They are said to be "savages" still, and doubtless in some respects they are such; but they are getting civilised as to their special trade, which is, has been, and for the present will be, the killing of their enemies. They import the best rifles, they collect cartridges sufficient for days of rapid firing, and their markmanship is positively terrible. The garrison of Chitral could not even look out of their loop-holes, so heavy and so accurate was the enemies' fire. The Pathans have learned how to build formidable breast-works, they have learned how to lay mines, and they are specially skilled in devices for effecting the reduction of stone forts. It is perfectly clear from the whole narrative that while our success was mainly due to the courage of the officers engaged, and the splendid tenacity of the Sikhs and Kashmiris, who fought the harder the more hopeless they became, it was due also in part to the miraculous good fortune which often attends British expeditions. A little more resolution in the Pathans, a little less awe of the white men, a little more good fortune, and we should never have reached Chitral, and should probably have had to endure all that men can suffer in a retreat of a hundred miles.

Reviews.

MIRZA HAIDAR'S HISTORY.

The Tarikh-i-Rashidi of Mirza Muhammed Haidar, Dughlát: A History of the Moghuls of Central Asia. An English version, translated by E. DENISON Ross, and edited with commentary, notes, and map, by N. ELIAS, H. M. Consul-General for Khorasan and Sistan. London: Sampson, Low, Marston and Co., Ltd.

Though the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* has already been to some extent drawn upon by historical writers and had its value acknowleged in such indirect ways, the present volume is the first to furnish a practically full translation of the work to English readers. Mr. Denison Ross appears to have done his share of the labour most efficiently; and Mr. Elias, besides the duty of general editor, took the precautionary trouble of going through the translation in company with Mr. Ross, in particular discussing with him the many passages where uncertainty arose. The Introduction is substantially a treatise in itself. In it, Mr. Elias speaks critically of the author and his book, of the line of Chaghatai, of the land of the Moghuls, of the people, Moghul, Turk, and Uighur, of the Eastern Khánate, or Uighuristan, and of the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* and after. The treatment is thoroughly workmanlike and capable. The numerous notes at the foot of the text are extremely useful—all the more so from the fact that Mr. Elias is "personally acquainted, more or less, with all the tribes and races Mirza Haidar introduces, and with most of the localities," as well as familar with the acknowledged authorities on the various points requiring elucidation. The map will be found especially serviceable. Its main purpose, of course, is to exhibit all the places mentioned in the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* that can be identified with reasonable certainty; and Mr. Elias believes it to be "the only map which contains most of the names used in historical works relating to Central Asia during the Middle Ages."

Mirza Haidar lived in stirring times. He was a soldier of fortune; and, while he wrote the history of his race and family, he wove into his narrative an account of his personal adventures and experiences, in no undue proportions. He was cousin to Baber, the first of the Moghuls of India—a scion of the Dughlát tribe, a sub-division or sept of the true Moghuls of Chaghtatai's line, and one that was accounted about equal, in point of nobility, to the Turki Barlás. Mirza Haidar describes himself as the son of Muhammad Husain Kurkán, son of Amir-i-Kabir Said Ali, son of Amir Ahmad, son of Khudaidad, son of Amír Bulaji. The last-named four were all Amírs of Kashghar, and Bulaji was the first of the line to become Mussulman. Mirza Haidar was born in the year of the Hajra 905 (A.D. 1499-1500) at Tashkand, the capital of the province of Shásh, of which his father, Husain, had been made governor some six years before by Mahmud, the titular Khan of Moghulistan and Kashghar. His mother, Khub Nigár Khánim was a daughter of Yunus, Khan of the Moghuls, and a younger sister of Kutlugh Nigár Khánim, the mother of Baber.

The times were troublous. "In the space of 120 years," writes Sir Henry Yule, "no less than thirty descendants or kinsmen of Chaghatai are counted to have occupied his throne; and indeed revolutions, depositions, murders, and usurpations seem to have succeeded each other with a frequency unusual even in Asiatic governments." Mirza Haidar's father, a treacherous and intriguing man, was put to death at Herat by emissaries of Shahi Bey Khan, the Uzbeg leader, when his son was but a child; and some of the retainers of the family, believing Mirza Haidar to be doomed to a similar fate, had him carried off to Bokhára and concealed. In 1508, at the age of nine, he was smuggled out of Bokhára by Maulána Muhammad, formerly his father's khálifa (religious guide), and taken, through hair-breadth escapes, into Badakhshán, where he was entertained kindly for a year by Khan Mirza, a cousin and dependent of Baber. Then Baber summoned him to Kabul, and treated him with much consideration. Mirza Haidar accompanied Baber in his subsequent expeditions against the Uzbegs, to Hisar and Samarkand, where he must have learnt a good deal of warfare as it was conducted in those days in Central Asia. About the beginning of 1514 he went to Andiján, at the request of his uncle, Sultan Ahmad, Khan of Moghulistan, and soon entered the service of Sultan Said Khan, the son of Sultan Ahmad. During some twenty years he served Sultan Said devotedly, for the most part in a military capacity. He not only took part in Sultan Said's wars against the Kirghiz and Uzbegs in Moghulistan and against other tribal enemies, but was entrusted with important commands on distant expeditions—in 1527, against the Bolor States (Hunza, Gilghit, Chitral, etc.); in 1529-30, against Badakhshán; in 1531—his most important service for Sultan Said—the invasion first of Ladak, then of Kashmir and Baltistan, and afterwards of Tibet proper. "The Holy War," the Mirza tells us, "is the main support and fortifier of Islam—the most efficient groundwork for the foundations of the Faith;" and these expeditions seem to have been undertaken mainly, if not wholly, on such pious grounds. The Tibetan enterprise was abandoned within eight marches of Lassa, owing to mortality among the horses, want of supplies, and the general distress caused by cold and the high elevation.

Meantime Sultan Said had died, and Rashid Sultan had begun his reign at Kashghar by putting to death many of his own relations, and among them the Mirza's uncle, Sayyid Muhammad Mirza, who had also done much faithful and arduous work for Sultan Said. The Mirza speaks of these events with much bitterness. Finding it impossible to remain longer in Ladak, whither he had retired from Tibet, he desperately dashed through some passes, with a score of followers, into Badakhshán, where he spent the winter of 1536-7. Next summer he repaired to Kabul, and soon afterwards to Lahore, where he was received by Baber's son, Kámrán Mirza, "with every mark of respect." "From the depths of distress and hardship," he writes, "I found myself raised to honour and dignity. The princely patronage and attention of Kámrán Mirza acted as an antidote to the numerous sufferings and griefs which had made the sweetness of life bitter on the palate of my soul." On Kámrán's proceeding to the relief of Kandahar, the Mirza was left at Lahore for a year as Governor of the Punjab, "collecting taxes, suppressing revolt, protecting the frontiers, and establishing Islam." In 1538, on Kámrán's return, his brother the Emperor Humayun was defeated in Bengal by Shir Sháh Sur, the Afghan leader, and called to his assistance Kámrán and his other brothers. The brothers fell out at Agra, and Kámrán returned to Lahore. Mirza Haidar, however, patriotically stood by Humayun then and thereafter, and Humayun treated him with great honour and called him "*brother*, after the Moghul fashion." At the disastrous battle of Kanauj, the Mirza acted as chief of the Emperor's staff, and also led the centre division. The final section of the Mirza's career is mainly occupied with his invasion and administration of Kashmir as regent for Humayun, 1540-1551. He found the province "in a state of ruin and desolation, and raised it to a land abounding in cultivation and flourishing towns; he extended the frontiers also, and ruled with moderation and justice." He was killed, apparently by accident, in putting down an obscure disturbance somewhere near Báramula on the Jhilam.

"What right have I," asks the Mirza, "with my poor learning and my want of capacity, to attempt to make my styleless reed flow upon the white sheet of literature?" "My justification," he answers, "lies in the fact that I have, during my life, collected many authentic facts concerning those Moghul Khákáns who were Mussulmans, and have also myself played a part in their history. At the present time there is no one but myself who knows these traditions. . . . . My object is not to extol my own merit, but simply to write a memoir, that the history of the Moghuls may not be entirely forgotten." Mr. Elias, partially following Dr. Charles Rieu, thus summarises the scope and character of the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*:

> "It may be regarded as the history of that branch of the Moghul Khans who separated themselves about the year 1321 from the main stem of the Chaghatai, which was then the ruling dynasty in Transoxiana: and it is the only history known to exist of this branch of the Moghuls. The original or western line—that of Transoxiana—was at that time declining in power, and through internal dissensions and administrative decay, was rapidly approaching a final dissolution. The princes of the branch then thrown off became masters of Moghulistan (or Jatah, as it was called at that period) and of all Eastern Turkistan, and continued as a ruling dynasty for more than two and a half centuries. The book is divided into two parts, called *Daftar*, the first of which is entirely historical, while the second contains reminiscences of the author's life and notices of Chaghatai, Uzbeg, and other princes with whom he was acquainted."

The first part, or history proper, was written in Kashmir in 1544-45, and was completed about February, 1546, or five years after the Mirza's installation as regent of that country.

> "It includes, however, a later addition, in which 953 of the Hajra (4th March, 1546, to 21st February, 1547.) is mentioned as the current year. For the earlier periods it deals with, it is based on the traditions handed down to the author chiefly by his older relatives, combined with the statements of Sharaf-ud-Din Ali Yazdi in the prolegomena of the *Zafar-Náma*;

> and, for the later periods, on his personal recollections. It contains a record of two distinct and parallel dynasties: (1) that of the Khans of Moghulistan, beginning with Tughluk Timur, who reigned from 1347 to 1362, and whose father, Isán Bugha, was the first to separate from the main Chagatai stem; and (2) of their vassals, the Dughlát Amírs of Eastern Turkistan, one of the earliest of whom, Amír Bulaji, the author's ancestor, had raised Tughluk Timur to the Khanship. In the second period, the family of the Khans divided into two branches, one of which superseding the Amírs of Kashgar (or Eastern Turkistan) continued to rule over Moghulistan proper and Eastern Turkistan, with their capital at Kashgar, while the other became rulers of the provinces eastward of Aksu (known as Uighuristan) and had their seat of Government usually at Turfán. The author concludes his account of each with a short sketch of their reigning representatives at the time of writing."

The second part, which has more than twice the extent of the first, and contains Mirza Haidar's record of his life and times, was the first in point of date.

> "The author wrote it in 1541-42, and, as he states in the *Prologue*, with a view to preparing himself for the more arduous task of historical composition. It begins with his birth and concludes with an account of his invasion of Kashmir, when by a battle fought on the 2nd August, 1541, he became master of the country. This part includes also some rules of conduct for kings, drawn up at the request of the author, by his spiritual guide, Maulána Muhammad Kázi, whose death in 1515 is recorded in the preceding passage; while another moral treatise by a holy Shaikh, Shaháb-ud-Din Mahmud, styled Ḳwája Nura, is inserted in full."

These two last-mentioned documents have been excluded from this translation, as not belonging properly to the history. The Mirza wrote in Persian, to him a foreign tongue. His work is a thoroughly serious one, intended, before everything else, to be a complete and trustworthy chronicle of the times. Considering the complications and obscurities of the period, he must be admitted to have been remarkably successful. His descriptive power is excellent, and his rhetorical flights are not seriously disconcerting. His weakness in chronology and his looseness in the expression of numbers generally and of measurements are ordinary Eastern failings, and much to be regretted. The chronological faults are, happily, partly remediable by reference to Chinese and other annals; but, unfortunately, "many interesting passages relating to military operations, the tribes, cities, ruins, and curiosities are greatly diminished in value, from the want of accuracy in the figures recorded. The tendency, generally, is to exaggerate freely." The absence of systematic arrangement involves frequent repetition and the involution of one subject with another. The portraits of the more eminent men, though no doubt touched up with characteristic exaggerations, are exceedingly interesting.

At the same time it must in fairness be noted that the Mirza seems to have tried steadily to keep in view the very truth of facts. "It is the practice of historians," he says (p. 129), "to recount everything as they find it, whether worthy or unworthy of mention. For it is not their object to write down the good qualities of princes, and to omit all their bad actions, but rather to reproduce all facts without discrimination, in order that they may leave behind them a record of the people of this world." Yet he hesitates to overdo a picture already sufficiently marked in outline and detail. "On consideration," he states (p. 258), "I have decided to withhold my pen from further details" of the savage cruelties of Mirzá Abâ Bakr, "for I do not wish the honourable mind of the reader of this Epitome to be clouded by the darkness of that black nature." On his invasion of Tibet, he indicates limits to his means of knowledge of the customs of the people. "I had much conversation with the Lámas," he tells us (p. 414), "with the help of an interpreter. But when it came to nice distinctions, the interpreter was at a loss both to understand and to explain, so that the conversation was incomplete." As to the vast idol-temple at Ursáng, "as what I heard concerning this temple," he declares (p. 411), "is incredible, I have not written it. There are many false stories told of it." As to Kashmir, "now that I . . . . have seen all that is notable in it, whatever I shall write will be what I have witnessed" (p. 424); and the Mirza notes the inaccuracy of the *Zafar-Námar* on the facts of Kashmir, for the author "had never been there himself, but derived his information from travellers who had not a proper regard for accuracy" (p. 430). Finally, "up to this point," he says (p. 146), "I have heard the story of Rashid Sultán from reliable sources in Hindustán and Kashmir, and have committed it to writing. After his victory over the Uzbeg, he marched on Andiján and Turfán. But the sources from which I derived the details of this matter not being trustworthy, I have not thought fit to enter them, and have therefore drawn in the reins of my pen from writing of these things." The Mirza's purpose was absolutely earnest, and it is plain that he did his best to ascertain and sift the facts, and to record them in reasonable fulness, good and bad. How far his judgment is to be trusted is another question. He was at any rate, as Mr. W. Erskine estimates, "a man of worth, of talent, and of learning," and, we may add on the Mirza's own *naïve* statement, a man of many accomplishments. He was also "a bigoted Mussulman and a fanatical Sunni." In short, as Mr. Elias puts it, "he belonged to his times, and herein lies the chief value of all that he has left on record."

THE MARQUESS OF WELLESLEY.

Life of the Marquess of Wellesley, K.G. By Colonel G. B. Malleson, C.S.I. Statesmen Series. (London: W. H. Allen and Co., Limited.)

The present volume is one of a series of reprints. The original publication was made in 1889. The edition is a cheaper one, and Colonel Malleson has added a new preface in which he seeks briefly to justify his high opinion of the brilliant Marquess. Lord Wellesley began his public career in the English Parliament in 1780. He distinguished himself at once as an eloquent speaker, and rapidly rose to a position of importance. In 1793 he became a member of the English Privy Council and of the Indian Board of Control, in which latter capacity he obtained "a thorough knowledge of all the details of Indian government, and of the dangers which might threaten the stability of British interests from the independent action of Native Princes in the very centre of the peninsula at a time when Great Britain was engaged in a war conducted with more than ordinary bitterness with a revolutionary power." In 1797 he was appointed by Pitt to succeed Sir John Shore as Governor-General of India. With the views of his predecessor Lord Mornington was far from concurring. Sir John Shore had previously been a civil servant of the East India Company, and his experience in that capacity, no less probably than his natural temperament, inclined him to a policy of peace. His conciliatory attitude had resulted in some loss of British power, and the Native Princes exhibited a tendency to combine against the English. The state of affairs when Lord Mornington reached India was indeed alarming. English relations with France were such as to give colour to the belief that any intrigue on the part of a native power would be welcomed and furthered by that country. On his passage outwards Lord Mornington received ample proof that Tipu Sultan was even then negotiating with the French, and in spite of professions of friendship the negotiations were carried on after the arrival of the new Governor-General. Lord Mornington was too diplomatic to show his hand before he had prepared for the extreme result of interference. But he began without delay to set his house in order. He arranged for the increase of the military forces, in spite of the objections of the Company's servants, who dreaded, in view of past disaster, to provoke a war. He entered into a new treaty with the Nizam, who agreed to dismiss the French contingent in his employ and to ally himself more closely with the English. When the action of Tipu rendered war necessary, it was brief and decisive. Seringapatam fell, and Tipu himself died. "Thus," says Colonel Malleson, "within three months of his arrival in India, Lord Mornington had settled two important, I might say indeed with truth, two vital questions."

The important services he thus rendered were awarded by an Irish Marquisate and the public thanks of both Houses of Parliament. Pitt wrote a letter of affectionate congratulation, but Wellesley could not conceal his disappointment. He felt that the reward was inadequate, and said so. Pitt's reply pointed out that any idea of inadequacy in the minds of others arose in his opinion from the Marquess's own view of the question, and no doubt there was much truth in the statement. Disappointment of this kind did not, however, lead to any lack of vigour in his policy. In the following autumn he proceeded to deal with the case of Tanjur. This State had been reduced to a condition of extreme wretchedness by a usurper. Unwilling to allow it to pass into the hands of a mere boy—the rightful heir—Wellesley arranged a treaty by which a suitable income was allowed to him, while the civil and military arrangements passed into the hands of the English. This line of policy he followed up in the case of Sarat, the Karnatik, and Oudh. If the arrangement was, to some extent at least, beneficial to England, it was probably not without advantage to the States concerned, for it is believed to have rendered the Government more stable, and the likelihood of petty warfare much less. Having now dispatched the question of a French invasion, and strengthened his position with the Native States, Wellesley turned to that fruitful source of mistrust—Afghanistan. The Shah of Persia was persuaded through the instrumentality of Captain, afterwards Sir John, Malcolm to renew his attack on the frontier of Afghanistan, and being thus engaged the ruler of Kabul had no time for an Indian campaign. The domestic administration was also the object of the Governor-General's attention. In financial matters various reforms were introduced, the army was more carefully organised and Lord Wellesley passed on to recommend a means of abiding improvement in the foundation of a college at Fort William. In the last instance, however, the disapproval of the Directors was at once expressed. The work was far too costly—a consideration for which the Marquess had the profoundest contempt. Their interference in other matters, chiefly of financial interest, provoked the resignation of the Governor in 1802. But it was not accepted, and in 1803, when he renewed his application to be released, the Maratha War was imminent, and he felt bound to keep his post. Before the war had reached its successful termination, the Marquess had quited India, his position being assumed by Lord Cornwallis.

Whatever view may be taken of some particular acts under his administration, it cannot be doubted that he did carry out in a marvellous manner the policy, such as it was, of extension of Empire which was common to him and his great friend and master. He was ably supported during his Indian career by Generals Harris and Lake, and the brother whose fame in subsequent years was to outshine his own. But this autocratic position in India had had its effects upon his character, and the manner of his reception in England was a bitter disappointment to a man of such haughty temper. Pitt had died immediately after his return, and it was not till 1809 that Wellesley received a Government appointment, as ambassador in Spain, from whence he was recalled at the end of the year to take office as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Once again Wellesley found himself in a position to carry out his own high-handed course of policy. And he did not hesitate to do so. In spite of much criticism he strenuously urged the continuance of the war. "For my part," said he in reply to Lord Lansdowne, "as an adviser to the Crown, I shall not cease to recommend to my Sovereign to continue to assist Spain to the latest moment of her existence. In the cause of Spain, the cause of honour and interest is equally involved and inseparably allied." The result of this policy was such as Lord Wellesley had foreseen. "The perseverance and resolution of the two brothers, the one at the Foreign Office, the other at the head of the Army, had, it was becoming every day more apparent to the clearer-sighted, effected the marvel which had been pronounced impossible; they had succeeded in inserting into the Imperial Tree the wedge which was to lay it low." In 1812 disagreement with his colleague with regard to the Catholic Disabilities, which Lord Wellesley wished to be removed, led to his resignation. The attempt on his part later in the year to form a ministry which should undertake this reform, together with a vigorous war policy was unsuccessful, and until 1822 he remained outside the ministry. In the latter year he was sent as Lord Lieutenant to Ireland, a country which at that time was described as "a tempestuous scene of violence, iniquity, and disorder." The grievances of the people were "undisguised, open, and palpable, and there seemed but small chance that any of them would be redressed." Lord Wellesley did what he could to further reform, but the vital reform was impossible, and in 1827 he returned to England to work again in the cause of Catholic Emancipation. The success of this measure was delayed by the action of Wellington's Government till 1829. From 1830-1834 he was again Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, after which time save for the post of Lord Chamberlain, held for a few days, he retired into private life, and seven years later died at the age of eighty-three. Colonel Malleson's profound admiration of this great statesman leaves its impress on every page of his book. That he was a great administrator, a man of brilliant genius and consummate energy, is certain. But he seems to have been qualified by disposition rather to adorn an elevated and isolated position than to work in harmony with colleagues of equal rank towards a common end. The present volume is well printed, and ought in this cheap form to find its way to a very large number of readers.

ANGLO-URDU MEDICAL HANDBOOK.

Anglo-Urdu Medical Handbook, or Hindustani Guide; for the use of Medical Practitioners (Male and Female) in Northern India. Compiled by the Rev. George Small, M.A., with the aid of Surgeon-General C. R. Francis, and of Mrs. Fraser Nash, L.R.C.P. and S. (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Co., 1895.)

The medical handbook compiled by the Rev. G. Small is a book which has long been needed. Anglo-vernacular grammars, dictionaries, and reading-books have been overdone, and until somebody takes the trouble to do something more than rearrange kaleidoscopically the material which has long been before the public no useful purpose can be served by their publication. The vernaculars of India are yet an almost virgin soil for linguistic research. Many of the commonest expressions and inflections still await exposition in the text-books. But replicas and permutations of what has gone before may be dispensed with. Aids to the acquisition of real knowledge are certainly in demand, and an increasingly large field is opening for scientific, historical, and other practically useful books connected with Indian vernaculars. Mr. Small has essayed to fill a void by offering lists of words in Urdu connected with the medical profession, such as the names of the minutest parts of the body, various diseases and accidents, surgical and dispensary appliances, hospital and kitchen furniture and utensils, clothes, medicines, metals, fabrics, tools, etc. Some fifty pages are devoted to common native medicines, arranged according to their operations on the human system. Their nature and names, both scientific and popular, are stated, and a set of diagnostic tables is supplied suited to various kinds of diseases and different parts of the body. This information, together with a specially arranged series of dialogues, must greatly facilitate communication between doctors and their patients. The plan of the book is to be commended, and it contains a great deal of useful information. The compiler might have supplemented the matter he gives without much difficulty from such books as Platts' and Fallon's dictionaries. These books will, in many cases, supply him with single words for terms which he now renders by a description; for instance, the aorta is called *shahrag*, a bicuspidate tooth is known as *jarh*, a dimple is *pichak*, the eye-ball is *dhela*, hydrophobia is *harak*, a gun-shot wound is *zakhm-i-banduq*, the sting of an insect is *zakhm-i-nesh*, and so on. There are also mistakes which require ratification. Thus the crystalline lens is *ankh-ka-tal*; the eye-lid is *papota* or *parda-i-chashm*. There are many such mistakes, and a plentiful crop in the dialogues, besides misprints in abundance. The book fails somewhat in execution, but will nevertheless be really useful in its present condition, and will form a good stock on which carefully selected material can be grafted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JUNE, 1895.

Atlantic Monthly. Rockhill, W. W., "Buddhism: A Pilgrimage to Wu-tai, the great Buddhist Sanctuary of North China."

Blackwood's Magazine. "Little Wars on the Indian Frontier."

Contemporary Review. Cobban, G. Mackenzie, "The Latent Religion of India."

Chambers's Journal. "Chinee Town, Calcutta."

Geographical Journal. Younghusband, Capt. F. E., "Chitral: Hunza and the Hindu Kush."

Humanitarian. India's Wrongs and India's Cure": Interview with D. Naoroji.

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). McClelland, B.H., "Poor Ambabai."

Nineteenth Century. Griffin, Sir Lepel, "Chitral and Frontier Policy." Khamji Ghulam-us-Saqlain, "The Mussulmans of India and the Armenian Questions."

Sunday Magazine. "Eha," "Voices of the Indian Night."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JUNE, 1895.

Thornton, Surgeon-General, J. H. .... "Memories of Seven Campaigns: A Record of 35 year's Service in the Indian Medical Department in India, China, Egypt, and the Soudan." (Constable.) .... 17s. 6d.

Ragozin, Zenaide, A., M.R.A.S. .... "Vedic India: As embodied Principally in the Rig-Veda." (Fisher Unwin.) .... 5s. 0d.

Thornton, Thomas Henry, D.C.L. .... "Colonel Sir Robert Sandeman: His Life and Work on our Indian Frontier." (John Murray.) .... 18s. 0d.

CELEBRATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF TULSIKRIT RAMAYAN. By Mr. F. S. Growse, M.A., C.I.E. Complete in 3 volumes. Fifth Edition. Highly spoken of both by English and Native Press. Also Second-hand books on sale. Price Rs. 3-6 by V.P. Post in India, and 4s. 6d. in England. Apply to Babu Harprasad, Municipal Commissioner, Fatehgarh, N.W.P., India.

Printed by A. Bonner, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 8.] (NEW SERIES.)] AUGUST, 1895. [SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus" .. 226
India and the General Election 230
The Rout of the Liberals 232
Indian Trade and Trade in India, IV .. 233
OUR LONDON LETTER 235
The New Secretary for India 236
The Chitral Campaign: Honours and Decorations .. 237
The National Indian Association: Interview with Miss Manning 238
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects.. 240
MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI ON HIS DEFEAT 241
EDUCATION IN INDIA, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D. 241
INDIAN ADMINISTRATION: A RETROSPECT, by J. Dacosta 244
THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SURVEY DEPARTMENT IN INDIA, by Parbati C. Roy 247
Indian Candidates for Parliament 250
Lord Sandhurst at Poona: Address from the Sarvajanik Sabha 253
Empire of India Exhibition, II 254

Indiana.

Disastrous as the results of the general election have been for Liberals throughout the country, there is no loss which will be deplored by a greater number of British subjects than the defeat of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in Central Finsbury. The news of the temporary exclusion of the "member for India" from the House of Commons has, with good reason, produced the keenest disappointment among those many millions of our Indian fellow-subjects who recognise in Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji their truest, most faithful, and most beloved representative. The loss is not confined to India, and the Indian National Congress. The Liberals of Central Finsbury are, for the moment, deprived of the services of a trusted and indefatigable champion, while the House of Commons will be sensibly the poorer for Mr. Naoroji's absence not only in the special province of Indian affairs but, generally, in character, in statesmanship, in political earnestness. No member of the House of Commons has earned in three years a higher or juster reputation for unflagging devotion and singleness of purpose.

Yet, bitterly as we must deplore the defeat of our Grand Old Man, it cannot, under all the circumstances, be said to be greatly surprising. The wave of reaction which submerged Sir William Harcourt and his magnificent majority in Derby and Mr. John Morley in Newcastle was nowhere more destructive than in London. Before the general election the metropolitan constituencies were represented in the House of Commons by 23 Liberals and 36 Conservatives. The ranks of the Liberals have been terribly thinned. London is now represented by 8 Liberals and 51 Conservatives, and the storm before which the narrow Liberal majority in Central Finsbury has gone down carried away also men like Mr. Cremer, Mr. James Rowlands, and Mr. G. Howell. The defeat of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji is, therefore, by no means phenomenal. On the contrary, the wonder would have been if, amid the general wreck of the Liberal party, Mr. Naoroji had succeeded in retaining a seat for which a Conservative was returned in 1886 and which in 1892 was won back for the Liberals only by the meagre majority of 5 votes.

Mr. Naoroji, as will be seen from the high-toned and inspiriting message to his fellow-countrymen which is printed on another page, refuses to be depressed by defeat. He has known too much of the fortunes of war to permit his purpose to be checked, or his resolution to be daunted, by a temporary reverse. Mr. Naoroji looks forward to re-entering Parliament, and everybody who is interested in the welfare of India will hope that a favourable opportunity may speedily arise. The Liberals of Central Finsbury, to whom the gratitude of India has been frequently expressed and will always continue, had certainly to contend against desperate odds. During the past eighteen months Mr. Massey Mainwaring, the Conservative candidate who now becomes the Conservative member, has wooed the affections of the constituency with uninterrupted assiduity and virtually unlimited resources. While Mr. Naoroji was busy in the House of Commons, zealously watching the interests of his constituents both in India and in London, his Conservative opponent, reinforced by a bevy of Primrose dames, was busy in Central Finsbury, bringing to bear upon impressionable electors the various and powerful modes of persuasion which are within the reach of Conservatives of ample leisure and substantial fortune. Mr. Mainwaring, in common with his Conservative comrades throughout the country, had two powerful allies—the influence of the Church and the influence of liquor. We discuss elsewhere some of the causes which have led to the rout of the Liberal party at the polls. In addition to these general causes, which were operative in all constituencies, there were also, in an industrial division like Central Finsbury, special circumstances that contributed to the difficulties of the Liberal candidate. For example, the closing of the polling stations at eight o'clock is undoubtedly a disadvantage to the Liberal party in a working-class constituency in London. The Conservatives, again, had an immeasurably better supply of carriages for conveying distant or indisposed voters to the poll, although in this respect Mr. Naoroji is indebted to the friendly aid of Lord Ripon who placed a private carriage at his disposal. One thing is certain. Mr. Naoroji's defeat was in no degree attributable to any dissatisfaction on the part of his constituents with the way in which he had discharged his duties. His Liberal supporters in Central Finsbury agree in regarding him as an ideal member.

Lord George Hamilton, the newly appointed Secretary of State for India, is no stranger at the India Office. He held the post of Under Secretary from February, 1874, to April, 1878. In the now famous debate on the cotton duties which took place in the House of Commons last spring Lord George Hamilton distinguished himself by opposing the duties, and, therefore, virtually advocating the insolvency of India with the consent of Lord Salisbury. It may be a mere accident that the politician who delivered that speech was appointed to be Secretary of State for India at a time when Conservative candidates in Lancashire were using the reimposition of the cotton duties "for all that it was worth" against the Liberal party. Nowhere have the Conservative gains at the General Election been more numerous than in Lancashire. Lord George Hamilton, who has for some time been in receipt of a political pension of £2,000 a year, is not a profound politician. He was Vice-President of the Council for two years, and First Lord of the Admiralty in 1885-86 and from 1886-1892. Last December he was elected Chairman of the London School Board. His career at the India Office will be jealously watched by Mr. G. N. Curzon.

The Earl of Onslow, whom Lord Salisbury has appointed Under Secretary for India, made himself prominent in the last Parliament by his persistent opposition to the "betterment" proposals of the London County Council. His official career has not hitherto been very distinguished. He was a Lord in Waiting in 1886, Under Secretary for the Colonies in 1887, and Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade in 1888. From 1888 to 1892 he was Governor of New Zealand. Last March he became an alderman of the London County Council. It was generally believed that he resigned the Governorship of New Zealand because he was reluctant to appoint a batch of new members of the Upper House sufficient to enable the Ballance Ministry to carry its measures. Neither he nor Lord George Hamilton is likely to give much trouble to the permanent officials at the India Office or to bureaucrats in India.

The official majority of the members of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure have, after all, resolved in favour of hole-and-corner enquiry. It will be remembered that, in answer to a question put by Mr. Seymour Keay in the House of Commons on June 20th, Mr. Fowler stated that it was for the Commissioners themselves to decide whether they would conduct their proceedings privately or in public. The question came up for decision at the first meeting of the Royal Commission which was held at the India Office on June 26th. Only three of the Commissioners, as I am informed, namely, Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. W. S. Caine, voted in favour of pursuing their enquiries with open doors. They were voted down by the official element with which the Royal Commission has been so lavishly supplied.

It is a new and a strange course to exclude the public, and representatives of the Press, from the proceedings of Royal Commissions, but it is difficult not to believe that in this case the decision was a foregone conclusion. A circumstantial rumour was, at any rate, current some time before the Commission met that the India Office had resolved to close the doors against the public. The decision will increase immeasurably the task of the advocates of retrenchment, and may not improbably reduce the enquiry to a farcical review of officialism by officials for officials. The Commission, which, in view of the general election, adjourned for a month at its first meeting accepted, I am happy to say, the important "Note" on Indian finance which is reprinted as a special supplement to the present number of India. The facts and figures contained in this "Note" should guide the deliberations of the Royal Commission into useful channels, but the decision in favour of secret enquiry is hard to understand and incapable of justification. Why does the India Office shrink from publicity? How comes it that the financial administration of the Indian Empire can only be examined, as if it were some specially odious law-suit, *in camera*? It is not, at all events, because deeds are good that their authors are said to prefer darkness to light.

But the history of this Royal Commission is a history of official obscurantism. First of all, the terms of the reference were most mischievously restricted, without any opportunity of criticism being offered to the House of Commons. Then the appointment of the enquiring body was culpably delayed from time to time over the greater part of a year. Next, when the Royal Commission came to be appointed, it was—I will not say "packed" but—somewhat generously furnished with departmental officials. Finally, it has resolved to pursue its investigations removed from the public ear and the salutary check of periodical reports in impartial newspapers. All this is irredeemably bad. In one point, and in one point only, the policy of the India Office appears to deserve commendation. Mr. Fowler, having last summer refused a Royal Commission and suggested instead a Select Committee, changed his mind at the beginning of the year and abandoned the Select Committee in favour of a Royal Commission. When, early in the year, Mr. Fowler was questioned on the subject, he gave the significant reply that a Royal Commission was to be preferred because the existing Parliament might prove to be short-lived. The forecast has been justified by the event. If a Select Committee had been appointed it would have gone the way of the Disestablishment Bill, and even if the new Government had consented to re-appoint the Committee it would, in view of the results in Central Finsbury and East Bradford, have been deprived of the services of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. W. S. Caine. The Royal Commission, however, remains, being, like the Crown itself, unaffected by dissolutions of Parliament.

There is, by the way, one passage in the official announcement of the appointment of the Commission which its members, we may hope, will not overlook:—

> "And we do further ordain that you, or any five or more of you, have liberty to report your proceedings under this Our Commission from time to time, if you shall judge it expedient so to do."

Here is an express invitation to the Commission to issue *interim* reports.

The "Chitral honours," particulars of which will be found on another page, do not appear to have given satisfaction either in England or in India to the advocates of trans-frontier aggression. There are, however, two voices, and they tend rather to answer each other. On the one hand, it is complained that the heroes of the Chitral Expedition—whose personal courage is recognised more cordially by none than by the strongest opponents of the "forward" policy—have not received the decorations deserved by their gallantry. On the other hand, it is urged, satirically perhaps yet not altogether without reason, that in view of the odd considerations which seem sometimes to prompt the offer of State honours, it is rather a distinction to lack than to possess them. If the heroes of Chitral are philosophers they will reflect that, after all, virtue is most rewarded in itself.

Meantime, what is of infinitely more importance than the question whether our soldiers have obtained precisely the right degree of official recognition, is the question whether Lord Salisbury's Government intends to ignore the decision of its predecessors and occupy Chitral. In the last number of India we were able to chronicle the satisfactory though belated resolution of Lord Rosebery's Government against the policy of occupation. It is now ascertained that early in June Mr. (now Sir Henry) Fowler communicated this decision to the Government of India. More than that, Lord Rosebery went out of his way to explain, at the great Liberal meeting at the Royal Albert Hall on July 5th, that his Cabinet was unanimous on the subject. His words were:—

> "The late Government never had an opportunity of announcing the unanimous conclusions at which they had arrived with respect to Chitral. They had instructed the Governor-General of India that, at the earliest possible moment consistently with safety and dignity, they should withdraw from Chitral. (Cheers). I have not time now to give the reasons for that decision, but if the new Government think of reversing it, I trust that they will mete out to us the measure that they asked us to mete out to them, and will give us an opportunity of discussing their policy before they finally adopt it." (Cheers.)

No sooner had Lord George Hamilton been appointed Secretary of State for India in the Coalition Government than he signified that he would not be bound by the decision of Lord Rosebery's Cabinet. On July 5th, a telegram from Simla announced that the Chitral expedition was estimated to have cost, up to that time, about 150 lakhs of rupees. On July 10th, the Simla correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed the following significant intelligence:

> "As Her Majesty's Government require time to decide on the permanent settlement of Chitral and the present season is unfavourable for the movement of large bodies of troops, Sir R. Low has to-day been officially informed that the troops occupying the Chitral and Dir road cannot be withdrawn

before September. He is accordingly directed to make the necessary arrangements for supplies."

These indications point all one way. It is noteworthy also that Lord Roberts, speaking at the Royal United Service Institution on July 10th, strongly advocated pursuit of the "forward" policy. The composition of the new Government is hardly reassuring. A Ministry that contains Lord Salisbury, Lord Lansdowne, and Mr. G. N. Curzon, who during the past few months has championed a far-reaching policy of trans-frontier aggression in frequent and enthusiastic letters to the *Times*, is not likely, except under strong pressure, to adopt a policy of peace and retrenchment. But if the Coalition reverses the orders of the late Government, and decides in favour of occupation, there will, at least, be no doubt as to where the responsibility lies. The Conservatives, who in Lord Lytton's time started the "forward" frontier policy, will have deliberately continued it, although during the past few years it has, as we have shown, cost Indian taxpayers more than thirty millions of money; although it is held by such competent judges as Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir David Barbour to lie at the root of India's financial difficulties; and although it is condemned as not only useless but positively dangerous by military experts like General Sir Neville Chamberlain, General Lord Chelmsford, General Sir John Adye, and General Sir Charles Gough.

It is considerations like these which make one wonder that, in the campaign of the recent general election, there has been so little attempt to trace the history of the "forward" policy and award the responsibility for it. There has hardly been a Lancashire constituency in which the Conservative candidate has not endeavoured, and endeavoured with success, to make capital against the late Liberal Government on the score of the re-imposition of the cotton duties. To examine the causes of the financial embarrassments which caused those duties to be revived—in other words, to trace the past records and to forecast the future course, under Conservative guidance, of the "forward" frontier policy—this was a task to which, so far as I can discover, not even a solitary Liberal candidate in Lancashire addressed himself. Perhaps some Liberals have now found out, too late, that it would have "paid" them to inform themselves a little as to the facts of Indian administration.

It is a strange, eventful history that Dr. G. W. Leitner unfolds in the remarkable paper which he contributes to the July number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* upon "The Future of Chitral and Neighbouring Countries." We cannot retrace here even the main outlines of the story, which, by the way, has been reprinted, and should secure a large and useful circulation. But Dr. Leitner sums up his opinion in a single sentence. "It almost seems," he says, "as if the Jingoes, Radical and Conservative, held a brief for Russia."

> "Russia has, in our recent Chitral Expedition, again scored a cheap and effective victory at our expense. She has now ascertained whether and in what force troops can operate on the Peshawur-Chitral route; here again the sea of mountains has been pierced by us in her interests, and she has succeeded, as at Gilghit, in drawing us far from our base. To alarm the British public, a silly demonstration on the Pamir was as successful as was Grombcheffsky's Hunza performance."

Again:

> "The fact is that Chitral was and is being sacrificed to the demands of *la haute politique* which in its imperturbable and cruel march, moves on to its purpose, irrespective of one and all of the avowed objects of an expedition having been previously achieved. That purpose is to prove in a tangible manner that England can exert her power right up to the general limits that are laid down for the Pamir agreement. This has been done *coûte que coûte* as regards Chitral, and will continue to be done in every direction in the still independent countries that intervene between Peshawur and the Hindu Kush. It is to the interest of Russia to make our respective frontiers conterminuous along a line of over a thousand miles with a number of weak points, through which it may be broken, so that our co-operation, or at least neutrality in European questions, may be secured for Russia by the simplest threat of a movement against India. . . . . There never was such a unanimous consensus of opinion as regards the folly and wickedness of the Chitral Expedition as exists among Indian civilians and even the bulk of military authorities. That it should have been undertaken under a righteous Government that abhors bloodguiltiness and with a Viceroy who prided himself on his want of initiative, will certainly be a puzzle to the historian who does not take into account the diplomatic requirements for the Pamir agreement."

And this is the fatuous policy which has brought the Government of India to the verge of bankruptcy!

As to the future, Dr. Leitner is, as might be expected, on the side of evacuation. Any other course would, in view of the Viceroy's proclamation, constitute "a shameful breach of faith." In his opinion Sher Afzul is still the only man to rule Chitral if we really wish to preserve the shadow of independence in that country. The proper and easy course, Dr. Leitner thinks, would be, after our immediate evacuation of Chitral and the road to it:

> "(*a*) Definitely to allot the suzerainty of Bajaur to the Amír;
> "(*b*) the Khan of Dîr to keep the road towards Swat on the one side and Chitral on the other;
> "(*c*) Sher Afzul to be restored to the Chitral throne or else the boy-Mehtar to be maintained under a regency composed of the chief hereditary landowners, and presided over by Muhammad Sharif Khan of Dîr."

"Anything," Dr. Leitner adds, "seems better than the nominal rule of a boy, nine years old—the constant companion of his uterine brother, the murderer, Amír-ul-Mulk, under the *de facto* Mehtarship of a British Resident for many years to come. There is no real necessity for maintaining a British Resident at Chitral, except as envoy (an Indian maulvi would be best) to give correct information, for actual experience has proved that the road from Peshawar to Chitral is one that can, at any moment, be occupied in case of need." It is to be hoped that Dr. Leitner's valuable article will not escape the notice of Lord Salisbury's Government.

The Poona Sarvajanik Sabha, the important representative body which was established a quarter of a century ago in order to make known to the Government the wants and wishes of the people of the Deccan, has supplied, in the address that is reproduced elsewhere, the occasion of Lord Sandhurst's first political speech since his arrival in the Bombay Presidency. The tone of the address and of Lord Sandhurst's reply augur well for the future of the relations between rulers and ruled in the Deccan. "Government," as the *Times of India* candidly admits, "need a good deal more criticism than they get," and if all criticism were as temperate and well-informed as that for which the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha has made itself responsible, the people of India would be the gainers. "The more moderate the statements, the less general and sweeping the assertions, the more weight," as Lord Sandhurst pointed out, "your counsels are likely to carry in the minds of thinking men." It is to be hoped that this warning will be borne in mind by Anglo-Indian officials, by the Anglo-Indian press, and by certain journals in this country which are at present too apt to deal with Indian affairs in a spirit of anti-popular generalisation.

Lord Sandhurst, who describes himself as "anxious to know the wants and wishes of the people and to come into touch as closely as possible with all classes" in the Bombay Presidency, has made an excellent first impression. His statement of his aims and purposes, and such acts as the concession of the elective franchise to the Local Boards of the Central Division, afford the best guarantees that the important matters brought to his notice by the Sarvajanik Sabha will not be overlooked. The Survey Department, for example, stands greatly in need of reform. We have discussed more than once the harsh revision settlements in such cases as the Panwel and Alibag talukas. Lord Sandhurst has also a splendid opportunity, in a time of peaceful relations, of establishing prudently, sympathetically, and on a permanent basis, effective means of conciliation between Hindus and Muhammadans. But the question which the Sarvajanik Sabha rightly placed in the forefront of their address related to the constitution of the new Provincial Service. The delay in the drafting of the rules is little short of a scandal, and it is plainly the desire of a section of the authorities to discredit the Provincial Service by permitting a form of competition so trivial as to involve all the dangers and weaknesses of a system of patronage. English observers must think it strange that Indians should have to remind the Government of the importance of maintaining a high standard of efficiency in the Public Service.

A Correspondent writes: "As to the 'regrettable incident' which occurred at Porbandar in Kathiawar some three weeks ago, when a collision attended with many casualties arose between a Muhammadan procession and certain Hindu wedding parties, full particulars are not yet to hand. Lord Sandhurst deemed it sufficiently important to warrant his sending a telegram to the India Office, with the sensible object of checking any exaggerated reports that might be coming forward. That purpose has been answered in so far that the public have let the verdict stand over until detailed accounts can be sent in due course. Probably it will turn out that there had been lack of police precautions; and, if so, as the State of Porbandar is at present under British administration, the Bombay Government may be trusted to clear the matter up and see that better measures are taken in future by the local officers concerned.

"It is a different and more serious matter if the authorities in the North-West Provinces and Behar have not yet succeeded in allaying the chronic irritation in these parts, of which the anti-cow killing riots of last year afforded such grave demonstrations. It is stated by one of my Indian friends that in the month of June three 'bad riots' occurred in the Tirhut district. No details of these incidents have appeared—at least, so far as I have seen—in the Indian journals. Had Parliament been sitting, this would have been a proper subject to be tested by questions in the House. It had been understood that the true and proper remedies for that irritation suggested by Mr. Arthur Rogers—based on closer investigations than any officials could apply—also urgently recommended by Sir William Hudson and his fellow-planters in Behar—had been frankly accepted by the Government of India just before Lord Lansdowne left. By the way, as any sort of procedure is easy enough in the Peers' House, it would be well if one or other of the ex-Viceroys would ask his lordship to confirm that position, as he could of his own knowledge. Possibly, though the Supreme Executive not only sanctioned but urged these remedial measures, which would have restored comity between races and creeds throughout Hindustan proper, we should find that the local authorities, more especially in the eastern districts that are under Bengal, have been slack and backward in taking measures which would remind themselves, if not the public, of the grave lack of impartiality on the part of some of them to which the outbreaks of last year were in some degree traceable. Sir Charles Elliott's successor should see to this, as also should Lord Elgin's Executive in its Home department. These imperfectly reported 'bad riots' in Tirhut during June may have been tided over; but it looks as if the mischief were still smouldering. This should be seen to; the local authorities are without excuse if this particular but preventable class of disorders should crop up again. The blame will rest, not on the mild though sometimes exasperated Hindu, but on the obdurate Britons, who, though their official eyes were at last opened, still refused to see.

> "The Secretary of State has ordered, in reply to a proposal from the Government of India to reduce the military expenditure, not to reduce in any way salaries of the 1st class District and 2nd class District Commandants, the Inspector General of Cavalry, and the Artillery Judge and Advocate-General, and Comptrollers, Military Accounts.—*Bombay Gazette.*

This curious proviso, which comes round to us from India, and may, therefore, be dated two or three months ago, is significant of two or three things. It is better indication than we had hitherto seen that the Indian Government had plucked up its courage, or evinced a return towards common sense, so far as to propose reductions of its military expenditure in any shape. Though these may be only of the cheese-paring sort, let us be thankful even for such small mercies. But, even in this, the check comes from this side. We may well ask in what direction this check is applied, and guess, if we can, in what bureau this tenderness for District Commandants, and the Inspector-General of Cavalry may have originated. As a matter of course, this untimely check on retrenchment had to go through the Secretary of State for India in Council—the 'late Mr. Fowler,' since made a G.C.S.I. But the originating motive which, we may take it, thus forced the hand of the then Indian Secretary is traceable to some power behind or outside the throne at the India Office. What and where is such power to be found? The answer is at hand. Those highly paid District Commands are mostly held by officers on the British establishment, the special *protegés* and clients of our War Office and the Horse Guards. This distribution of the 'prizes' of military appointments in India will be more and more prevalent under the much vaunted 're-organisation' into four Army Divisions and the abolition of the Bombay and Madras Chiefs. So it comes to this—though the military authorities in India may feel constrained to yield to the too tardily awakened dread and determination of the Finance Minister, they shall not be permitted to trench, if it can possibly be avoided, upon these patronage preserves of our War Office and Horse Guards, which are doubly dear because—'India pays.' This very conspicuous straw may serve to show which way the wind blows, and indicates the secret instructions which will have been confided to the Treasury Office Chairman of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure. It is a very open secret that those instructions must tend to this effect—that there shall be no lessening of the grip which the above-named powerful departments have ever kept, more so since the Amalgamation, on the Indian revenues. By the same token it is intended that every effort shall be made by this same Commission to prevent any new charge, however just, coming on the British Treasury.

FIDUS.

INDIA AND THE GENERAL ELECTION.

INDIANS will naturally ask how their interests have fared in the general election. "We are all members for India," said that cheery official optimist Mr. Henry Fowler, a few months ago. The election addresses of candidates hardly confirm the proposition, or, if it be true, candidates and electors alike succeed in disposing of Indian problems with amazingly little trouble. Perhaps the time may yet come when a general election in the United Kingdom will be fought chiefly upon Indian issues, and when the paradox "we are all members for "India" will seem less grotesque. But that time is not yet. For the present, British subjects in India are directly interested in the chances of a general election only so far as to trace the varying fortunes of politicians who, while their chief duty is to English, Scotch, Welsh, or Irish constituencies, do nevertheless endeavour in the House of Commons to protect the rights and represent the wishes of the Indian people. There are good reasons for the exceptional intensity of this interest in the recent campaign. In the first place, three Indians went to the polls, as compared with one Indian candidate in the General Election of 1892. In itself, that fact marks a notable advance. The results, however, can only be described as deplorable. We refer elsewhere to the defeat of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in Central Finsbury. Mr. Naoroji is, we venture to say, the only supporter of the Indian National Congress who is not distressed by his misfortune. Nobody has ever accepted defeat with more cheerfulness or with greater courage. He was overthrown by a wave of reaction which was nowhere more sweeping in its effects than in the metropolitan constituencies. The temporary loss of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji would have been less severely felt if Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee had been returned for Barrow. The people of India would have had unbounded cause for rejoicing if that eloquent voice, that ripe experience, and that sturdy faith had been present to help them in the

House of Commons. Mr. Bonnerjee fought splendidly. He rallied the Liberal party in Barrow to his side, and the fact that he failed to oust the sitting member, Mr. Cayzer, only shows that, at this election, nobody could have ousted him. Mr. Bonnerjee, as was inevitable under the circumstances, entered the field late. He has laid the foundations of a future victory which, we trust, will not be long delayed. As for Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree, who won an unexpected victory for the Unionists in North-East Bethnal Green, we prefer to refrain from judging him hastily. The best hope which we can entertain in regard to him is that he will disappoint the expectations of a certain group of his supporters. We refuse to believe, without overwhelming and indisputable evidence, that any Indian would enter the House of Commons with the deliberate intention of misrepresenting his fellow-countrymen, and, to the best of his ability, thwarting their aspirations.

When we turn from the fortunes of Indian candidates to the results in constituencies contested by candidates who, though they are not Indians, are nevertheless specially concerned for the welfare of the Indian people, we find a mingled record of triumph and defeat. Every reader of India will rejoice at the re-election of Sir W. Wedderburn who, as Chairman of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress and of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, has rendered and will continue to render yeoman service to the cause of Indian reform. In the present state of parties in the House of Commons the duties which will devolve upon Sir W. Wedderburn will be onerous and difficult. The people of India may well congratulate themselves upon having, in the forefront of their Parliamentary battle, so strong and courageous a leader. Mr. C. E. Schwann, another trusted champion of Indian reform, has retained his seat in North Manchester amid the general wreck of Lancashire Liberalism. Mr. Herbert Roberts has been re-elected in West Denbighshire, and Mr. Alfred Webb, the President of the Indian National Congress, holds his seat in West Waterford. Other members of the British Committee have been less fortunate. Mr. E. H. Bayley has been defeated in North Camberwell, Mr. W. S. Caine, good at need, has shared the triple defeat of Liberalism in Bradford, Mr. J. Seymour Keay has lost Elgin and Nairn, and Mr. W. S. B. McLaren has suffered defeat in the Crewe division. Of nine members of the British Committee who, before the dissolution, were members of Parliament, five have been defeated. Three of these—Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. Caine, and Mr. McLaren—were members of the Executive of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. The remaining members of the Executive Committee have, we are happy to say, been returned to Parliament. Looking through the list of members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, one finds a mournful series of disasters. Mr. Herbert Paul, who moved the famous resolution in favour of simultaneous examinations, has for the moment been rejected by South Edinburgh, but so brilliant a man is not likely to remain long outside the House of Commons. Mr. T. Snape no longer represents the Heywood division, unless, as has been rumoured, his successful opponent should be unseated on petition. Nor can we profess to rejoice at the return of Mr. J. M. Maclean for Cardiff. On the other hand we have to chronicle at least two notable additions to the party of Indian reform—Mr. C. P. Scott, the distinguished editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, has been elected in the Leig division of Lancashire, and Mr. Michael Davitt in East Kerry.

Although Indian problems occupied, as we have said, no prominent position in the general election as a whole, they constituted, in a superficial form, a disturbing element in most of the contests in Lancashire. The Conservative party is apt to pride itself upon a scrupulous theory of our Imperial obligations. The claim received a rude shock from the votes of many Conservative members on Sir H. James's motion touching the re-imposition of the cotton duties. It has received a still ruder shock from the appeals which the overwhelming majority of Conservative candidates in Lancashire have permitted themselves to make to the electors. "The "late Government," wrote, for example, the Conservative candidate for Bury in his address to the electors, "has done serious harm to the town "of Bury and neighbourhood by allowing the "Indian Council to impose the 5 per cent. duty on "English cotton goods, and I hope our new Govern-"ment, if it does not abolish this tax will make "the Indian mills pay (they can well afford) their "fair share of the amount required." Mr. George Kemp, who defeated Mr. Snape in the Heywood division, declared in his address: "I believe that "the cotton duties lately imposed are calculated to "act injuriously upon our staple industry of Lanca-"shire, and, if returned to Parliament, I will support "any attempt to have them repealed." We find similar statements in the election addresses of the Conservative candidates for Oldham, Preston, Burnley, and Stockport. In many cases where a Conservative candidate refrained from mentioning the Indian import duties in his address, he, and his supporters for him, endeavoured on the platform to make use of them as an instrument against the late Liberal Government. Such is the Imperialist conscience of the "patriotic" party when it is brought to the test of an electioneering campaign. The exhibition must have been very shocking to Mr. Goschen, though it can hardly have disconcerted Lord George Hamilton. Above all, it undoubtedly caught votes and won seats. The Conservatives triumphed in cotton-spinning England. It was to be expected that, in these circumstances, Liberal candidates would, in mere self-defence, have traced the causes of financial embarrassment in India and laid the blame upon the right shoulders. We look in vain for any such counter-campaign against the authors and finishers of the "forward" frontier policy. The result is, for the moment, grievous. But perhaps India will not in the long run be the loser if the bitter experiences of the Liberal party, especially in Lancashire, at recent elections prove to them the expediency—to put the matter upon no higher ground—of giving a little more attention to Indian affairs.

THE ROUT OF THE LIBERALS.

THE defeat of the Liberal party at the general election, which is now on the point of ending, has amounted to a positive rout. When Lord Rosebery's Government resigned office it was able to show, on paper, a majority of 28. On the day on which we write (July 26th) Lord Salisbury's Government has secured a majority of 138 on a division, and there is no reason for thinking that the few remaining polls will bring about any serious reduction in this formidable figure. It is perhaps too early to perceive accurately the various causes to which this signal rout of the Liberals is due, but it would be affectation to deny that the chief causes, at any rate, are recognised and admitted by critics well qualified to form an opinion. We may, of course, dismiss at once the theories of those who loudly ascribe their defeat to a single misfortune, a single unpopular measure, a single error of judgment, or a single hostile influence. The explanation which is capable being put in the proverbial nutshell is not usually very valuable. Undoubtedly the Liberal party has suffered greatly from the retirement of that pre-eminent leader of men, Mr. Gladstone. Hopes were at one time entertained that, at the general election, Mr. Gladstone would help his party on the platform, and there is reason to believe that under certain circumstances such help would have been forthcoming. As it was, the Liberal party went into battle not merely without Mr. Gladstone's aid, but nder the nominal leadership of one who, it is to be feared, ceased to arouse much public enthusiasm hen he left the Foreign Office to become Prime Minister. Lord Rosebery, while his associations ith "the turf" tended to alienate those sterner forces to which Liberalism has in the past made its adiest appeal, failed to unite the competing sections which it is perhaps inevitable that a party of progress should contain. The Liberal programme was a programme of heroic measures, each of which gave offence to some powerful interest. While, therefore, Liberal politicians were endeavouring to inspire the unreceptive mind of the average Englishman simultaneously in respect of many different subjects, their opponents were able to make use of the contention, such as it was, that the Constitution was being destroyed piecemeal, and that practical measures of social reform were subordinated to the Quixotic pursuit of idle revolution. The contention was, of course, grotesquely false. It ignored a series of administrative reforms to which no parallel can be found under any previous Government, and of legislative achievements to the unrivalled importance of which Mr. Chamberlain himself has borne unsolicited testimony. But a party attacked, as the Liberals were, from all sides at once needed, above all else, what the Liberals lacked—a leader.

It is an open secret that, if Mr. Gladstone's advice had been followed, Parliament would have been dissolved in the autumn of 1893 after the Lords' rejection of the Home Rule Bill. Mr. Gladstone, however, on almost the only occasion in his political career, allowed his judgment to be over-ruled by the representations of his colleagues. They urged that it was inexpedient to permit the House of Lords even to seem to have forced a dissolution, and that it was the duty of a Government which had been returned to carry out the Newcastle Programme to lay all their measures before Parliament and the country. This plan of campaign brought the Liberal majority in the House of Commons into repeated collision with the House of Lords, and Liberal managers began to rely for future success upon the cumulative indignation which, as they hoped, would be provoked in the country by the mutilation or rejection of their measures. This was the policy of "filling up the cup." It may have been the most hopeful policy which, under all the circumstances, was open to the Government. But it contained, at any rate, two elements of weakness. The first arose from divisions within the Liberal party in the House of Commons. There were few members who regarded each of the Government's Bills with the same degree of friendliness. Some Liberals were hardly reluctant to recognise in the House of Lords a third combatant that could be trusted to deal with the Bills they disliked. The other element of weakness arose from the terrible shortness of political memories. Indignation against the House of Lords, instead of accumulating with successive acts of mutilation or rejection, ebbed away with successive delays. Lord Rosebery did not improve matters when, at Bradford in the autumn of last year, he undertook virtually to predict that a revolution should take place on that day twelve months. Needless to say, the opportunities which

Liberal procrastination threw away were not lost upon the Conservatives. Never within recent years has the Conservative party been more on its mettle. Constituencies were assiduously "nursed" by wealthy candidates, backed up by the influence of the Church and the influence of liquor. It is common to ascribe the Liberal defeat chiefly to the Local Veto Bill. That measure was, no doubt, absurdly misrepresented and misunderstood. But the fault of the theory lies in the notorious fact that the "liquor interest," as it is called, is not now for the first time hostile to the Liberal party. What has proved more formidable to Liberals than hostility without is division within, and until some sort of cohesiveness is obtained—in particular, by the elimination or supersession of the more selfish and narrow Whig element—the Liberal party may whistle down the wind for a working majority. Concentration of purpose and of forces and the development of genuine and unselfish political interest are, with the general spread of education, the instruments to which Liberals will have to look for future victory. Perhaps one of the best guarantees that they will not look in vain is to be found in the fact that, of the members of the late Liberal Government, there is no name which arouses so much enthusiasm among the Liberal rank and file as the name of that brilliant statesman and orator, Mr. Asquith.

INDIAN TRADE AND TRADE IN INDIA.—IV.

(From a Correspondent.)

Besides animal and mineral oils, there are about three hundred oil-yielding plants in India, of which nearly seventy are of real commercial value. Of this large number only eight or ten are made use of, while the export trade is almost confined to six plants. The importance of this trade may be gauged by the fact that about 5,000,000 gallons of oil and 15,500,000 cwts. of oil seeds are exported annually from India, but this large trade is small compared with what it could easily become if Indians were to take the needful care to prepare the articles. The export trade represents only one-third of the total quantity grown. Indeed, with the exception of the great staple articles of food (rice, wheat, millet, and pulses), there is no more important product in which Indians are concerned than oil.

The plants chiefly used for their oleaginous properties are linseed (*alsi*), rape (*rai* and *sarson*), cotton (*kapas*), gingelly (*til*), earth-nut (*mung-phali*), castor (*arend*), and poppy (*aphim*). The seeds of these plants contain from twenty per cent. to fifty per cent. of oil, in the extraction of which from forty per cent. to seventy per cent. of oil-cake is produced for the nourishment of sheep and cattle, besides a large quantity of residual waste of great value for manuring purposes. The seed is bought for the sake of the oil it contains, the cake and the waste being sold as bye-products to increase the profit of the transaction. It is evident, therefore, that the freight on the most valued constituent of the seed is greatly enhanced by the weight of the other matter carried along with it. In the case of a seed containing thirty per cent. of oil, more than three tons of seed must be carried in order to get one ton of oil to Europe, and, although it is true that a higher freight is charged for oil than for seed, it is not by any means three times as high. This, as far as the oil trade is concerned, is a great drawback, and oil could be sold at a cheaper price and a larger business done if its conveyance were not burdened with this surplus charge. The bye-products, of course, have a value and are able to bear the freight charged by the existing method of transit, else the trade which is now done could not be carried on. But what the traders of India have to realise is that their country produces 2,500,000 tons of oil-bearing seeds annually, and they have to ask themselves whether that vast quantity of property is used and sold in the most profitable way, and whether the trade can be increased to India's advantage.

It is obvious that the disposal of produce in its raw state is the most wasteful and least profitable form in which it can be sold. At times it is of course the only form of trade possible. But such a trade should be converted into a manufacturing trade at the earliest possible moment. Raw products are always sold at their lowest prices, because all the trouble and cost of the manipulation involved in bringing them into a condition of utility is placed on the buyer. Thus the producer has the least chance of profit and all the risk, besides losing the profit on the manufacturing processes. In the case of agricultural produce he has the further disadvantage of seeing his land grow continuously poorer from the loss of the waste products of manufacture, and he is, therefore, compelled to spend some of his small profits on manure in order to keep his ground in reasonable condition. Losses such as these are conspicuously apparent in the case of linseed. The cultivator receives about £5 per ton for the entire seed. But each ton of seed contains oil worth £7; oil-cake worth £4; and waste worth 10s. He thus parts with property worth in England, £11 10s. for £5. The cost of expressing the oil from a ton of seed (thereby producing nearly one-third of a ton of oil, and about two-thirds of a ton of oil-cake), by the aid of a simple English hand-press, is about 13s. The only other expense is the packing, transit to the coast and shipping to Europe, which for one-third of a ton, would not exceed 22s. This would give the cultivator 5s. per ton more than he now receives for his produce, besides leaving in his possession 11 cwts, of oil-cake per ton of seed to feed his cattle, and 3 cwts. of excellent manure for his fields. The oil-cake could be exported also, for it sells at from £7 to £10 per ton, and, as the cake would cost nothing but the transit it would add materially to the grower's profit. The profit on the oil-cake can be largely increased by the preparation of a special oil-cake containing 12 parts pure linseed cake, 4 parts bran (*chokar*), 1 part of earth-nut cake (*mung-phali*), and 1 part of rape cake (*sarson*). This compound, which is much cheaper than pure linseed-cake, is readily purchased in England, because it is fattening to cattle and is easy of digestion. A simple mixture of 6 parts of linseed-cake and 2 parts of bran would also be preferred to pure linseed cake. But these articles must in all cases be ground separately and carefully mixed together in the proper proportions in order to produce the cake required in England. Unless the work be properly done it had better not be attempted. It will be seen, however, that it is well worth the trouble, for the combined cake sells for £10 per ton, and the bran which is used to mix with it is almost valueless in India. This use of bran will assist the creation of a wheat-grinding industry by finding a sale for the bran produced.

Only large cultivators could attempt to extract the oil from their own seed, but there are many collectors of produce—*baniyas*, *mahajans*, *Marwaris*, etc.—who might well collect oil-seed at centres not very remote from the fields where the plants grow, and place hand-presses there, so that the cake and waste might be utilised on the spot, leaving the oil alone to be exported.

If it be thought that the purchase of presses and the reorganisation of a larger trade is a great undertaking, involving an expenditure of time, trouble, and money, beyond the power of those who are now engaged in the work, it may be pointed out that a single English hand-press, costing about £40, can crush a ton of linseed in three days. Three such presses would crush one ton a day, and this is quite enough for a large domestic trade, and even for a small export trade. But should the extraction of the oil in a commercial way be deemed too heroic an effort at the present time, it is easy to show that the very seed itself is sold in a recklessly wasteful fashion. It is sold by *baniyas* to European Agents for about Rs. 4 per maund, that is, about 20s. per quarter of 410 lbs. The conveyance of a quarter of linseed from the fields to England is about 12s., and in England a quarter of Indian linseed sells for 38s. It is thus seen that a *baniya* by selling in India, instead of selling directly in England, loses 5s. or 6s. per quarter, or about one rupee on every maund he sells. This means a loss of 20 per cent. of the price, the whole of which would be additional profit and this could be secured to the great advantage of India, without the least loss, but rather to the gain of England also.

It must, however, be remembered that although immediate profit could be made by selling oil-seeds in Europe, instead of disposing of them locally, something else is required in order to establish an oil-trade with Europe. The first essential is that the various kinds of seeds should be kept apart, and properly cleaned before being pressed. The careful separation of the seeds would be most advantageous to India even for the mere sale of the seeds themselves. Indian linseed is the richest in oil and the most nourishing to cattle. Yet England gets the greater portion of her linseed from the Russian ports in the Black Sea. The reason is that the majority of Indian cultivators grow linseed and rape in the same field, and are generally careless as to the purity or their seed-crops. It is true that Russian linseed is far from faultless in this respect, but Indians deliberately mix two crops in one field, as if determined to lower the value of both articles. If Indians were to grow their linseed apart, and guard it from admixture, even passing it through cleaning machines before shipping it, they would secure the trade of the world in that article, for there is no linseed known in the world which can compete with theirs in quality or in cheapness. If their seed were clean it would rise in price, as well as increase in sale, and the foundation would be laid for a great export trade in oil. It is the admixture of seeds which is the great barrier to a great export oil-trade, for the oils from different seeds possess widely different qualities, and reduce each other's value. Linseed is highly valued for its drying quality, and this is why it is used for mixing paints, and forms the basis of all kinds of varnishes. On the other hand, rape yields a non-drying oil, and therefore the prime quality of linseed-oil is materially diminished by an admixture of rape-oil. Indians will see how greatly they reduce the value of their crops by growing these antagonistic seeds together. The same remark applies in different ways to all kinds of seeds. Even if the special uses of any kind of seed be unknown, it may be taken as certain that unmixed seed will always command a higher price than that which is mixed, even when the buyer intends to use it for the purpose of adulteration.

The uses to which oils are put are various but as articles of diet, illuminants, ingredients in the manufacture of soap, candles, paints, etc., and as lubricants and medicines, they have an enormous sale. The local uses of oil are by no means unimportant. It is, of course, of small importance whether an oil smeared upon the hair, or rubbed over the body, be perfectly homogeneous in character or not, but there are uses such as those of food, medicine, soap and candle manufacture, paints, varnishes, etc., in which the nature and purity of the oil used is the prime consideration. Several oils are used for lighting and washing purposes, and a little trouble would soon teach Indians the methods of extracting the glycerine and oleic acid from them, by means of sulphuric acid or milk of lime. Were this done a trade in superior candles and high-class soaps would arise. Also the glycerine and oleic acid would be set free and could be used in other processes or sold as lucrative exports. Several candle-factories and soap-works on a small scale are already at work in India, and they require only better material to operate upon in order to rise to important industries.

Perhaps the most popular oil in India is the Sesamum. About ten million acres of land are under this cultivation, and yield about 3 cwts. of seed per acre, or a total of 1,500,000 tons of seed per annum. Much of this is used as food in the shape of sweetmeats, etc., and the oil is used for anointing the body, for soapmaking, for burning in lamps, and for extracting the perfume from flowers. It is, indeed, a beautifully clear and delicate oil, and there can be no doubt that, if unmixed seed of good quality were produced, and pure oil were offered for exportation, a great future is open to this valuable product. A great many tons are sold annually to Arabia and Ceylon for £4 15s. per ton; but none of the seed reaches the great markets of the world. Some of the oil reaches England where it sells for about £50 per ton. Now the seed consists of six-fifteenths oil, and nine-fifteenths oil-cake; therefore in every ton of seed there are 896 lbs. of oil and 1,344 lbs. of oil-cake. This quantity of oil at £50 per ton is worth £20, and the oil-cake is worth fully £6 more. Thus Indians are yearly giving away tons of their property worth £26 for the sum of £4 15s. It is almost inconceivable that such waste should have been going on for generations under the ægis of the most commercial nation on earth without an effort being made to instruct the people as to the real value of their products.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The *Daily News* (July 26th) understands that the Government have not arrived at any decision in favour of retaining the present Speaker. It is said that Mr. Balfour wishes to see Mr. J. W. Lowther Speaker, and Mr. Stuart Wortley, Chairman of Committees. If Mr. Lowther were elected, it would, of course, be on the express understanding that the Liberals would turn him out as soon as they got a majority. The *Times* and some other Unionist organs have advocated the re-election of Mr. Gully.

It is curious to note how closely the Conservatives have attained to the Liberal position of 1885. In that year it was doubtful to the close of the election whether the Liberals would secure a majority or not. In the result they came out 355 strong, making just half the House, and the final Conservative total cannot be far removed from that figure. Ten years ago there were 86 Nationalists to whom the Liberals looked for support, and the Conservatives will be looking for support now from about 70 Dissentients. In the 1885 Parliament the Conservatives, forming till the introduction of the Home Rule Bill practically the whole of the Opposition numbered only 249. So far in the present election, the Liberals and Irish Home Rulers returned number 231, and it may be expected that in the end the total will exceed the Tory 249 of ten years ago. The change is great, but it may be reassuring to compare it with what has taken place in earlier elections. In 1868, for instance, 382 Liberals were returned to a House then consisting of only 658 members, in 1874 there were 352 Conservatives, and in 1880 there were 350 Liberals again.

There is some speculation as to whether the Conservatives will obtain a slight majority in the House apart from the Dissentient Liberals. As 335 members make half the House, the smallest number that could give a majority would be 336. On the polls declared before we go to press 328 Conservatives had been returned. There then remained 49 members to be elected, but these were in constituencies that returned only five Conservatives to the last Parliament. If the five were again returned, and no change took place in the other constituencies, the Conservatives in the new House would therefore number 333. The polls yet to be declared may give further Conservative gains, but it is still an open question whether that party will obtain a majority of their own and what its proportions may be. In any case the majority, apart from the Liberal Unionists, must be very small.

The *Court Circular*, dated Windsor Castle, July 4th, contained the following announcements:—The Right Hon. Henry Fowler, M.P., Secretary of State for India, and Mrs. Fowler arrived at the Castle. The Right Hon. Henry Fowler was introduced to the Queen's presence and delivered up his seals of office as Secretary of State. Her Majesty afterwards conferred upon him the honour of Knighthood and invested him with the Insignia of a Knight Grand Commander of the Star of India. Lady Fowler was then introduced to Her Majesty's presence by Lady Ampthill, Lady in Waiting, and was invested by the Queen with the Imperial Order of the Crown of India.

The list of "dissolution honours" announced at the beginning of July included a G.C.S.I., for Mr. H. H. Fowler. His opposition to the "forward" policy in Chitral may reconcile some Indians to a compliment which much of his record at the India Office can hardly be said to have merited.

The other Indian honour was a Knighthood for Mr. Cowasjee Jehanghir. The *Times* describing him as "the son and heir of the late Sir Cowasjee Jehanghir Readymoney, the Parsee philanthropist of Bombay, whose public benefactions in Western India vied with those of the first Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy," suggested that it was presumably "not only an account of his own munificence, but in fresh recognition of that of his father, that the honour has again been conferred on a member of the family." It will be remembered that the new Knight recently sent a handsome donation to the Imperial Institute.

Commenting on the appointment of the Earl of Onslow to be Under-Secretary for India, the *Daily Chronicle* said:—The Earl of Onslow's appointment to the India Office Under Secretaryship is unobjectionable, on the principle that those who know something of a particular question should go where they cannot make use of their knowledge. Lord Onslow is acquainted with the Colonies, therefore he goes to look after India. Lord Ripon knew India as no other statesmen knows it, therefore he was sent to the Colonies. Is it not time that these ridiculous observances should cease?

The Secretary of State for India has appointed Mr. Francis Whitmore Smith to be Assistant Military Secretary at the India Office, in the room of Mr. J. Horsley Mayo, retired.

A meeting of subscribers to the women's testimonial to Sir James Stansfeld on the occasion of his retirement from the House of Commons was held on July 4th at the residence of Mrs. F. Pennington, 17, Hyde-park-terrace, the meeting being called to decide the form which the testimonial should take. Among those who attended were Lady Farrar, Lady Carbutt, Mrs. Clayden, Mrs. Fawcett, and Miss Sharman Crawford. Mrs. Pennington (hon. treasurer) read the financial statement showing that nearly £600 had been received.

Finally the following resolution was carried unanimously:—"That, bearing in mind that Sir James Stansfeld has declared the question of equality of men and women in all respect before the law to be the greatest question of the day, this meeting approves the idea of devoting the greater portion of the funds raised to the furtherance of that cause by means of the foundation of a lectureship to be held by women on the legal *status* of women under the common and statute law, and requests the committee after consultation with Sir James Stansfeld, to draw up a scheme." The proposal that a personal gift should be presented to Sir James Stansfeld was also carried.

A Return of the Revenue and Expenditure of British India bears at least (writes the *Daily Chronicle*) this one lesson written large on its face—that India cannot afford any further expenditure on "a vigorous frontier policy." The military expenditure has risen from 170,000,000 rupees in 1884-5 to 240,000,000 rupees in 1893-4, while the cost of collecting the revenue has grown from 51,000,000 to 62,000,000. The income showed no such elasticity, the land revenue in particular being raised by only about 43,000,000. Opium, between the first year and the last, had a considerable decrease, while in some of the so-called earning departments the expenditure, one year with another, exceeded the income. Thus in 1892 3 the excess of expenditure was over 8,000,000 rupees, and in the last year under account some 15,500,000 rupees. Yet we are to add to the burdens of India by annexing Chitral, if the new Government is of the mind of many of its supporters and some of its members!

The registers at the Imperial Institute showed, at an early hour on the evening of July 16th, that over one million visitors had entered the Collection and Exhibition Galleries since the opening of the buildings. This total did not include the number of Fellows and their friends who had made use of the club apartments in the main building. Of the million who had visited the galleries and their contents, over 600,000 were free visitors, and the remainder paying visitors.

There is an interesting account of Mr. Dodgson, better known as Lewis Carroll, the author of "Alice in Wonderland," by Mrs. MacKenna, in the *Ladies' Home Journal.* Mr. Dodgson is a clergyman in deacon's orders; he was never ordained a priest, owing, it is said, to a slight hesitancy of speech which prevents his speaking in public. This, however, he has in a measure overcome, and he now not infrequently reads the lessons and prayers at the college services in the Cathedral. He has even occasionally been known to preach at the special services for the college servants, but it is very rarely that he mounts the pulpit. He is a creature of habit, and in term time is never absent from his own particular seat in St. Mary's for the University sermon, always staying to matins afterward. During the last five-and-twenty years he has hardly ever been missed from his accustomed place.

Photography is one of Mr. Dodgson's favourite recreations, and it is not surprising to learn that children are his favourite subject. In fact, it is said that he adores children under every condition. "Of course he is immensely popular among small folk, but their affection is mingled with a certain amount of awe, for he has a quaint way of talking to them about great and beautiful things in an elaborately mystifying way, which, while it somewhat confuses his juvenile listeners, delights the grown-ups." Mr. Dodgson is a great lover of mystery and mystification, and it is, no doubt, partly owing to this that he is so extremely sensitive on the subject of his name and his whereabouts.

Mr. Dodgson's chambers in the Tom Quad are perhaps the finest in Christchurch, and he is particularly proud of them. "The ascetic-looking figure of the Christchurch don may often be met trudging steadily along the roads several miles away from Oxford, for he has always been a great walker, and he is not the man to give up any good habit. Most of his rhymes are composed while he is out walking. Quite recently, when he was asked to do some elementary mathematical teaching in the absence of the regular tutor, he replied, 'Certainly,' adding as an afterthought, 'I must take a lot of long walks to recover my Euclid, which I haven't touched for twenty years.'"

THE NEW SECRETARY FOR INDIA.

PRESS OPINIONS OF LORD G. HAMILTON.

Lord George Hamilton becomes Secretary of State for India. A worse choice there could hardly have been. Lord George Hamilton's speech on the Indian cotton duties was the most discreditable incident in that famous debate. The Tory Party as a whole came out of it very well. Although they had been diligently whipped up to defeat the late Government they yielded to the convincing arguments of Mr. Fowler and declined to treat Indian finance as a mere question of party. Lord George Hamilton, on the other hand, jeered at Mr. Fowler's grave declaration of policy, and scoffed at the danger of ignoring native opinion. It was observed at the time that he claimed to speak on behalf of Lord Salisbury, and now he has his reward. His selection is not more appropriate because he succeeds one of the ablest administrators who ever presided over a public department.—*Daily News.*

Lord Lansdowne will make a very good Secretary for War. . . . . A far less friendly reception will be given to Lord George Hamilton's nomination to the Secretaryship for India. The news has a serious concern for London, for Lord George must vacate the Chairmanship of the London School Board, and his withdrawal may be the forerunner of a purely partisan appointment to a great administrative office. —*Daily Chronicle.*

Lord George Hamilton's appointment to the India Office will no doubt scandalise the younger Tories. It was hoped that Mr Curzon, the writer of so many fiery letters in favour of aggression on the North-West Frontier, would have the post, and even the *Times* had consigned Lord George Hamilton to the outer darkness. He was to occupy himself with the work of the London School Board, as Mr. Jackson was to be content with the control of the Great Northern Railway.—*Manchester Guardian.*

Lord George Hamilton will be able to utilize at the India Office his previous experience in that department.—*Times.*

Lord George Hamilton will no doubt, discharge his functions as Secretary of State for India with the same ability and assiduity which earned him so much respect in other posts.—*Standard.*

Lord George Hamilton will make the worst Secretary for India we could imagine. His speech on the Indian cotton duties alone disqualifies him for the post. He spoke on behalf of Lord Salisbury, and gave the House to understand that he did not care a button for native opinion. And this is the man whom Lord Salisbury selects to govern India! Lord George Hamilton might easily have been shelved, like many other respectable Tories, especially in view of the fact that he enjoys a pension of £2,000 a year.—*Star.*

We have already pointed out the reasons for regarding Lord George Hamilton as the worst possible Secretary of State for India. At a great crisis, when the bulk of the Conservative party in the House of Commons subordinated faction to the welfare of India, Lord George, with the assent of Lord Salisbury, subordinated the welfare of India to the interests of faction. Lord Salisbury has now stamped that conduct with his formal approval, perhaps hoping to gain a few votes in Lancashire by suggesting the repeal of the cotton duties.—*Daily News* (July 1st.)

THE CHITRAL CAMPAIGN.

DECORATIONS AND PROMOTIONS.

The *London Gazette* of July 16th contained despatches from Lieut.-Colonel Kelly giving details of the march of the Gilgit force under him upon Chitral, and the crossing of the Shandur Pass; from Captain Townshend, narrating events at Chitral during the siege; and from General Sir R. Low regarding the operations of the relief expedition. The *Gazette* also contained the following decorations and promotions:—To be Ordinary Members of the Military Division of the Third Class or Companions of the Order of the Bath: Lieutenant and Brevet Colonel James Graves Kelly, A.D.C., Indian Staff Corps, and Captain Brevet-Major Charles Vere Ferrers Townshend, Indian Staff Corps. To be Companions of the Distinguished Service Order: Captain and Brevet-Major Harry Benn Borrodaile, Indian Staff Corps; Lieutenant Herbert John Jones, Indian Staff Corps; Lieutenant Stanley Malcolm Edwardes, Indian Staff Corps; Lieutenant John Sharman Fowler, Royal Engineers; Lieutenant Bertrand Evelyn Mellish Gurdon, Indian Staff Corps; Lieutenant William George Lawrence Beynon, Indian Staff Corps; Lieutenant Cosmo Gordon Stewart, Royal Artillery; Lieutenant Henry Kellett Harley, Indian Staff Corps. To be Majors, dated 10th July, 1895: Captain Colin Powis Campbell, Indian Staff Corps; Captain Henry Benn Borrodaile, Indian Staff Corps; Captain Charles Vere Ferrers Townshend, Indian Staff Corps. Lieutenant-Colonel James Graves Kelly, Indian Staff Corps, to be Aide-de-Camp to the Queen, with the rank of Brevet Colonel, dated 10th July, 1895.

The Victoria Cross has been conferred upon Surgeon-Captain Harry Frederick Whitchurch, Indian Medical Service. During a sortie from Chitral Fort of the 3rd March last, at the commencement of the siege, Surgeon-Captain Whitchurch went to the assistance of Captain Baird, 24th Bengal Infantry, who was mortally wounded, and brought him back to the fort under a heavy fire from the enemy. Captain Baird was on the right of the fighting line, and he had only a small party of Gurkhas and men of the 4th Kashmir Rifles. He was wounded on the heights, at a distance of a mile and a-half from the fort. When Surgeon-Captain Whitchurch proceeded to his rescue, the enemy in great strength had broken through the fighting line, darkness had set in, and Captain Baird, Surgeon-Captain Whitchurch, and the Sepoys were completely isolated from assistance. Captain Baird was placed in a dooly by Surgeon-Captain Whitchurch, and the party then attempted to return to the fort. The Gurkhas bravely clung to the dooly until three were killed and a fourth was severely wounded. Surgeon-Captain Whitchurch then put Captain Baird upon his back, and carried him some distance with heroic courage and resolution. The little party kept diminishing in numbers, being fired at the whole way. On one or two occasions Surgeon-Captain Whitchurch was obliged to charge walls from behind which the enemy kept up an incessant fire. At one place particularly the whole party was in imminent danger of being cut up, having been surrounded by the enemy. Surgeon-Captain Whitchurch gallantly rushed the position, and eventually succeeded in getting Captain Baird and the Sepoys into the fort. Nearly all the party were wounded, Captain Baird receiving two additional wounds before reaching the fort.

Commenting on the Chitral honours, the *Times* wrote:—It will scarcely be contended by the most austere critic that the distribution of honours on account of the Chitral expedition errs on the side of extravagance. We are not prepared to say that the rewards announced this morning are inadequate if regarded in the abstract, or from an ideal standpoint. But the public are compelled to look at these things comparatively, and it will be generally felt that, if the Chitral honours are sufficient for the occasion, similar honours have frequently been very easily won. Lieutenant-Colonel Kelly performed one of the most remarkable military feats to be found in annals peculiarly rich in extraordinary exploits. His march from Gilgit to Chitral has been graphically described by our Special Correspondent, and appeals to the mind with scarcely diminished force when presented in the bald language of a general order. With some 400 men, a couple of mountain guns, and a few native levies, Colonel Kelly marched 220 miles through a most difficult and a hostile country, crossed a path 12,000 ft. high through snow 4 ft. deep, fought two victorious battles with an enemy strongly intrenched and numerically superior, relieved the garrison of Mastuj, and finally raised the siege of Chitral. The transport mules and ponies were unequal to the tasks imposed upon them, the coolies had deserted in large numbers, but such was the force of discipline and the energy of the commanding officer that the Shandur Pass was successfully crossed by the expedition carrying its own guns and stores. Perhaps the nature of the feat can hardly be fully appreciated except by those who have had some practical experience of the handling of metal at temperatures far below zero; but 43 cases of frost-bite and 63 of snow-blindness amount to one-fourth of the force, and may serve to convey some idea of the purely physical difficulties that had to be overcome. The military difficulties were not less formidable, and nothing but the utmost circumspection on the part of the commander, seconded by the most unflinching devotion on the part of the men, could have carried the expedition triumphant through its trials. For an exploit of this kind, so far removed from the conventional fulfilment of obvious duty that frequently receives an equal reward, a Companionship of the Bath hardly appears an adequate recognition. It seems, however, that some sacred and inviolable rule of etiquette makes it impossible to give more than a C.B. for any service, no matter how great and striking, performed by one who does not already enjoy the distinction of writing these magic letters after his name. Neither Colonel Kelly, who made that tremendous march, nor Captain Townshend, who was the life and soul of the desperate defence of Chitral fort, without which the march would have been made in vain, is in a position to receive any higher appointment to the Order of the Bath than that actually bestowed. We may hope that to this cause, rather than to any failure to appreciate the unique services rendered by both, is due the strictly-moderate recompense they have received. Surgeon-Captain Whitchurch receives the Victoria Cross for the gallantry with which he rescued Captain Baird when mortally wounded during a sortie from Chitral fort. When every man of the little rescuing party had been killed or wounded, Surgeon-Captain Whitchurch took his disabled comrade on his back and by almost superhuman efforts brought him into the fort under an incessant fire from the enemy. Surgeon-Major Robertson, C.S.I., who played so conspicuous a part in the defence of Chitral, is made a Knight Commander of the Star of India. The Distinguished Service Order is bestowed upon Captain Borradaile, who was first over the Shandur Pass, as well as upon several other officers honourably mentioned in the despatches. Our soldiers, happily, are the last to scrutinize too minutely the distribution of honours and decorations for arduous duty nobly done. But though they take it all as in the day's work, the country would gladly see proportion observed in the bestowal of rewards. On this occasion the unique character of the services rendered does not, perhaps, seem to be fully reflected in the distribution of honours.

The correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed from Simla on July 18th: The Chitral honours have excited some comment here. It is considered that Lieutenant Harley's gallantry has not been sufficiently recognised, as his brilliant leading of the sortie was the main feature of the siege.

THE NATIONAL INDIAN ASSOCIATION.

INTERVIEW WITH MISS MANNING.

I first heard Miss Manning's name (writes a representative of India) on a certain day when I was stranded at Lahore, early in 1890. I had travelled from Delhi to Lahore by the night mail, and remained gently slumbering in my berth in the train after a troubled and noisy night. At length the guard came, and I enquired when the train would start for Mooltan. "It started quarter of an hour ago. You should have changed. This train is going to Peshawur," said he in a deprecating tone. Eight hours would elapse before the next train. But I made the best of the situation. I hired a carriage and a guide, and industriously "did" Lahore. I saw mosques, towers, bazaars, the Shalima Gardens with their curious long tanks, prim walks, and water fountains. Then the guide suggested that I should visit a neighbouring village. A member of the chief Muhammadan family of the place came out to receive me and do the honours; together we viewed the outside of the mosque and passed through the hot, dusty, dirty, narrow streets, followed by the ragtag and bobtail of the place, as is usual on such occasions. The young Indian gentleman told me that the year before Miss Manning had honoured their village by a visit. That I should visit it likewise seemed to him very peculiar conduct, especially as I assured him I did not know Miss Manning, and was even so ignorant that I did not know of her work.

Seated in a pleasant room in Miss Manning's house in West London, she laughed at this half link that had connected us, as probably the only two Englishwomen who had ever visited the place alone.

"Oh, it was certainly Baghbanpur"—I could not even name the place—"I was there in the cold weather of 1888-89 in order to gain some personal knowledge of India and to visit schools. I met the ladies and girls of the family you mention. They showed me the embroidery on their dresses, worked by themselves, and some of the girls read, one very fluently, in Urdu. It may have been Muhammad Shafi who showed you round. A typical village in its heat, glare, mud houses, blank walls, dust, and hospitality, is it not? After my visit to the ladies was over, breakfast was provided for me in another house. The Indian gentlemen stood and talked to me whilst I, all alone, tried to eat. I remember it so well, now you recall it to my mind."

"I understand, Miss Manning, that the National Indian Association is interested in education."

"Yes, one of our aims is to advance education and social reform in India. Miss Mary Carpenter founded the Association at Bristol in 1871. In 1877, upon her death, the Association moved to London, and I undertook to be hon. secretary."

"For the moment, I forget the social work that Mary Carpenter did?"

"Her chief work was the establishment of reformatories and industrial schools. In her later years she became much interested in India, which she visited several times."

"Then was the Association her own idea?"

"Yes. She had been acquainted with one of

India's earliest social and religious reformers, Rammohun Roy, and was considerably influenced by her friendship with him. The reform movement also received a strong impetus from Keshub Chunder Sen. I knew Miss Carpenter personally, and she was friendly with my step-mother, author of a standard book, called Ancient and Mediæval India."

"Why do you call yourselves 'National'?"

"Miss Carpenter adopted that designation in order to show that the principle of the Association was one of wide-spread and sympathetic co-operation. You know at that time political societies hardly existed in India. Such have now taken up the name 'National' but we keep to it (as it is difficult to change a title once appropriated) in the sense originally intended by Miss Carpenter. We were and we remain non-political. We can thus unite those of different parties who all alike care for social and educational progress."

"Do you specially take up the cause of women's education?"

"We do, though not that alone. It was largely owing to Miss Carpenter's influence that normal schools for training women teachers were established by the Indian Governments in the Presidency towns. Women teachers are a great want in India."

"I suppose you mean Indian women?"

"Certainly. We are so decidedly of opinion that all reform must come from within, that I did not think of mentioning that. Besides that we are non-political, our educational work is apart from missionary effort. We are not hostile to missions, and gladly acknowledge the good that they are able to do, but we think that England owes a duty to India, such as we lay stress upon, without pressing all her sympathy into a religious channel, which necessarily narrows the field. We consider that education should be encouraged among those of every religion."

"All thoughtful people will admit you are right. But how can you raise money? About the only organisation of English society, or at least infinitely the largest, is the religious one."

"Well, of course, we don't get much money. Our branches have their own funds, but we have only a beggarly £200 a year to distribute from the centre to educational agencies for Indian women."

"And I expect you want £2,000,000."

"I don't know that we are quite ready for such an exchequer as that," replied Miss Manning. "But we greatly need money. It grieves one to have to refuse help when one sees that that help is judicious, necessary, and would repay a hundredfold. We have carefully to hold the balance between different cases and consider which will yield the best results, when what we ought to do is to help many."

"Do you think there is any truth in the statement that Indians don't, when one is able to discern remoter effects and judge of them, really profit by Western education?"

"I should say that upon the whole the effects have been good. But I think that Western education was not introduced at first into India in the best form and manner. Those who directed it were not always educationists. There was not sufficient regard paid to the characteristics of the people, nor sufficient study of child nature. The same mistakes prevailed in England, and it was perhaps unfortunate for India to have come under England's educational influence just in the middle of this century. We did not try enough to understand the people, did not co-operate with them, nor they with us. We transplanted something that had not been well thought out, confused instruction with education, and the result is that in some quarters such education has not proved satisfactory."

"I wonder if that is the reason why Muhammadans have held aloof from Western culture to such a large extent."

"There are other causes for that, but Muhammadans are now awakening to the value of education. What I have said, however, applies as much to men's as to women's education. It has been observed that our system among girls has sometimes produced conceit, discontent, a longing for change and variety, a tendency towards undutifulness. A transition time is always one of difficulty. But things are improving. We now know better what India needs. Educated men are beginning to express their views in regard to the education of their wives and daughters. Formerly they could not do so, for they hardly knew themselves what was wanted. Perhaps more reflection and more time were needed on both sides at the beginning."

"People must get their experience by a few blunders. Everybody else does; why not educationists in India? I am told that your Association also gives friendly aid to Indian students in London?"

"Yes; there are numerous ways in which we can forward their objects in coming to England. Many of the students bring letters from friends in India, and we are always glad to give them advice or help, such as they may find useful, especially on first arrival. So many students are now here that they greatly help each other. But there are some matters, such as introductions, recommendations as to families for residence, tutors, etc., which depend more on English people. I have had great pleasure in making the acquaintance of many Indian students. It often surprises me to notice how perseveringly they carry out their aims, and how bravely they bear the inconveniences to which they are almost necessarily subject in a country so different from their own."

"Has not your Association some special arrangements for taking charge of students?"

"Yes, we have a small Superintendence Committee for undertaking, if parents desire it, the care of the younger students sent to England. It appears to us a serious mistake that those who are still almost boys should be allowed to come over without proper guardianship. I may say that in several cases it has proved of real advantage to the students to be guided by this Committee.

"Do you advise Indian gentlemen to bring their wives?"

"No, not young uneducated wives. They would be too much of a hindrance to their husbands' studies. An educated woman, married or single, is on a different footing, and often does very well; a stay in England is then a great experience. Lady Dufferin's fund helps suitable women to come here, and I believe that very good results are obtained. In the last few years many lady students have visited

England for study of various kinds—especially training and the art of teaching. One took up law in order to help and advise her countrywomen in that line. Another studied painting. I see much of these ladies, and have formed pleasant friendships with several."

"I am told that the Association has a magazine."

"Yes, the *Indian Magazine and Review*, which I edit. We try to extend knowledge of India and the people by its agency. Like most other papers which have a serious object and are not collections of clippings, it could do with a larger circulation. Of course we have reason to be grateful for what we can do, and for the many places the magazine reaches. I wish we could have more sympathy here in regard to Indian women's education; I don't think it is properly realised how far-reaching is the effect when it is known that an object is heartily approved at home. Indians seem to be encouraged by such sympathy."

"Do Anglo-Indians help you?"

"Yes, we get a fair amount of assistance from them. We wish we could do more to bridge over that aloofness between the Englishman in India and the people he lives amongst; there is reason to regret it. There are no doubt difficulties from both sides, and some men are too over-worked to attempt social life among the people."

"Why not try to enlist Englishwomen on your side? They do very little, as far as I could see, but amuse themselves, and they tire of that in a given time. Much of their poor health means that life has not sufficient solid interest for them."

"We do get some help from the ladies at the stations; occasionally they do wonderful work, but official life is full of changes. One advantage of an Association is that it serves to make efforts for educational work and social intercourse in India more continuous. It is by no means easy. You see religious prejudices, although they are passing away, still exist. For instance, an Indian lady has been known to take a bath because an English lady has shaken hands with her, and trifle as it is, it rather quenches the enthusiasm of the latter for intercourse with the people."

"Yes, one needs to remember how different the point of view of Indians is, and to be bent upon winning them. I always think the Government should show the Civil Servants that it appreciates friendly intercourse with the people. Do English ladies not visit the schools?"

"Yes, a little. I wish they visited a good deal more and showed more sustained interest."

"I suppose few Indian ladies go to mixed parties."

"Some do, the Brahma Somaj ladies, for instance. At times purdah parties are given, and social gatherings are pretty freely attended by Christian and Parsi ladies. It is largely a question of education, and at present Indian parents, as is the case with the majority of English parents, spend most upon the education of boys. The girls are coming on, but slowly. The Indian Governments are liberal in regard to girls schools, but they have to retrench at present, and voluntary Associations have therefore a wide field for usefulness."

"I can't remember the name of that excellent man, but he was a Governor of Christ's Hospital, who said that if only one of two parents were educated and thoughtful, it had far better be the mother."

Miss Manning smiled. "Well, public opinion in India has not reached that point. I ought to have said how much we work through our branches. In a branch we find that an Indian gentleman and an English lady as co-secretaries give the best results. And we are much helped by two excellent women inspectors in Madras, Mrs. Brander and Miss Carr. They are enthusiastic and at the same time judicious."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JULY, 1895.

Blackwood's Magazine. Thorburn, S. S., "Afghanistan, Our Last War with the Mahouds."

Fortnightly Review. "The Defence of Fort Chitral."

Geographical Journal. Black, C. E. D., on "The Indian Surveys, 1893-94."

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). McClelland, Mrs., "The Last of the Old Rajahs;" Carstairs, Robert, "A Village School;" Chan-Toon, "Hints to Indian Law Students."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JULY, 1895.

Stubbs, Major-General F. W.......“History of the Organisation, Equipment. and War Services of the Regiment of Bengal Artillery." Vol. III. (W. H. Allen.)	25s. 0d.
Nikambe, Shevantibai M.....“Ratanbai: A Sketch of a Bombay High-Caste Hindu Young Wife." (Marshall Bros.)	— —
"The Chitral Expedition." (Reprinted from the *Pion er.*) (Allahabad, *Pioneer* Press.)	— —
"Archæological Survey of India." New Imperial Series. Vol. XXII. The Bower Manuscript. Facsimile leaves, Nagari transcript, Romanised transliteration and English translation with notes. Edited by A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, Ph.D., Principal, Calcutta Madrasah. Part II. Fasciculus II. Published by order of the Government of India, and under the patronage of the Bengal Government. (Calcutta, office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, India.)...................	— —
"Anglo-Indian Cookery at Home." (Horace Cox.)	1s. 0d.
Gardner, Mrs. Alan.......“Rifle and Spear with the Rajpoots." Illustrated. (Chatto and Windus.)	21s. 0d.
Saint-Hilaire, J. Barthelemy......“The Buddha and His Religion." (Sir John Lubbock's Hundred Books, 94.)	5s. 0d.
Hanna, Col. H. B., B.Sc.......“Lord Roberts in War." (Simpkin, Marshall.)	1s. 0d.

CELEBRATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF TULSIKRIT RAMAYAN. By Mr. F. S. Growse, M.A., C.I.E. Complete in 3 volumes. Fifth Edition. Highly spoken of both by English and Native Press. Also Second-hand books on sale. Price Rs. 3-6 by V.P. Post in India, and 4s. 6d. in England. Apply to Babu Harprasad, Municipal Commissioner, Fatehgarh, N.W.P., India.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, AUGUST, 1895.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI ON HIS DEFEAT.

MESSAGE TO HIS FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji sends us the following important communication:

I have had nearly half a century of varied public and private life—political, social, educational, commercial, administrative, etc.—and I have had, like every human effort, my successes and failures. But I have, I may say, never been either unduly elated by any success, or depressed by any failure. In such a general wreck of the Liberal party, I have suffered as one of them. But the only policy upon which I have acted through life—the policy of "Go on, with patience and perseverance" whether successful or unsuccessful in any good cause—is the one upon which I shall act now as ever before. As long as I have the health and opportunity of serving my country I shall continue to do so. This is the last work of my life, and I intend to go on with it. I mean, therefore, to try to get into the House of Commons again, as it is there that the battles of the grievances and necessary reforms of India, and the stability of the British Empire have to be fought. The good of India is the good of the British Empire. The Indian question is of far wider importance than merely the interests of India. It is the question of the very existence, stability and continuance of the British Empire. As my views on this great subject have been made public at various times, and will have to be expressed yet many a time more on suitable occasions, I need not repeat them here, beyond saying that vast and powerful forces are working and growing in India. If the statesmen of the day do not direct them to the promotion of the interests of the Empire, producing satisfaction and prosperity among the people, they cannot and should not expect that these forces will not go against the British rule, and end in some disaster. My humble efforts have always been, and will continue to be, directed to avert this calamity as far as an individual's efforts can go. My countrymen in India need not be in any way discouraged by my defeat. The interest in Indian affairs has been gradually but surely (though slowly) increasing among the British people, and I shall always cherish the hope that the British people will some time see that their true interest consists in promoting the interests, contentment and prosperity of India, and not in persisting in the unnatural present policy which is gradually leading to the discontentment and continuous poverty of India.

DADABHAI NAOROJI.

EDUCATION IN INDIA.

BY PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

"We have opened to India a new door, a new life of knowledge, and the strongest arms in the world never again can close the door." So wrote Mr. James Routledge some twenty years ago, and the striking words embody an incontestable fact of the deepest importance. Education is the most powerful lever available for the expansion and elevation of Indian life—for the material and moral progress of India. Happily, too, the people take to it kindly, and even with avidity.

> "Never (says Mr. Routledge) was there a people more eager for education, or who deserved to be more leniently and kindly dealt with in that eagerness. 'Give us knowledge' is the cry, at least throughout Bengal. A certain class of Englishmen in keen ridicule reply, 'Go to your work; what has your M.A. degree done for you?' The Bengali turns away from such men, with his insatiable craving only the more whetted by the repulse. He will work night and day, and will endure much persecution, if only he can have that upon which he has set his heart, the knowledge that will enable him to rise in life. 'Yes,' it is said, 'that is all he cares for—to rise in life;' a rejoinder which comes badly from Englishmen, who in most cases are in India for that special purpose, and no other. The native of India, Hindu and Muhammadan

> alike, where the latter is not altogether reckless or despondent, wishes to better his condition in life. . . . . Again, I have heard it said that a native of India goes as far as he is taught, and can go no farther. I deny this thoroughly and entirely. It is a gross misrepresentation. The native of India is an essentially capable man.

It is now close upon thirty years since Mr. Naoroji acknowledged, in a very able paper read before a meeting of the East India Association, that "Government is fully alive to the value of education as the best means of elevating the nation, and of securing to the British rule sincere gratitude and loyalty."

> "The impulse (he proceeded) is given; the higher classes of natives are gradually perceiving the value and necessity of education; and before long I hope to see good results. For the education of the mass of the people, however, there is much room for more strenuous and greater efforts."

The good results that Mr. Naoroji hoped to see have, in large measure at any rate, followed; but notwithstanding the long strides that have been taken, it still remains true that there is much room for yet more strenuous and greater efforts.

In India, the systematic diffusion of instruction among the masses of the people by public authority is an institution of only some forty years' standing. Prior to the predominance of the East India Company in Bengal, instruction was practically limited to the Bráhman and the Mussulman scriptures, including "the whole body of science based on Vedic tradition and the whole outgrowth of law and tradition depending for its authority on the Kuran". The pandit and the maulvi communicated their narrow, if high, culture to a narrow, if high, class of students. In a lower sphere, the village pandit or guru inculcated by rote the Sanskrit texts of daily ceremonial application. The mosque reader exhibited the pronunciation, tone, and gesture appropriate to the repetition of the texts of the Kuran. Local teachers laboured to instil the rudiments of the three Rs into the minds of the children of the trading classes. The village school "appears to have been either a rote-school for the inculcation of texts or a secular institution of a very low type, of which few beyond the local Bráhman and the trader took advantage." The earlier educational efforts of the East India Company were almost exclusively directed to the higher or secondary instruction. The real foundation of a general system was laid in the memorable despatch of the Court of Directors in 1854. Mr. Baines, in his Decennial Report of last year, outlined the main provisions of this "masterly State document":

> "It covers, in fact, the whole ground now occupied. Amongst its most important provisions are (1) the creation of a Department of Public Instruction, for direction and inspection; (2) the establishment of Universities at the Presidency towns; (3) the initiation of training institutions for teachers, the extension of middle-class and primary schools, and the adequate provision of State colleges and high schools, with, also, a system of grants-in-aid. The lower and higher schools were to be linked together by a system of scholarships. Attention was to be paid to the development of girls' schools, and, above all, the necessity was insisted upon of bringing education within the reach of the masses, without allowing the people to rely solely on the provision of educational establishments by the State, but, through the system of grants and otherwise, to stimulate private effort, so that finally it would be possible for the State to withdraw almost entirely from direct participation in instruction, except in regard to general control and to tracts or classes where its initiative was temporarily required."

The charter of 1854 was confirmed in 1859 after the assumption of dominion by the Crown. In the interval it had been found that English and secondary education was fairly well supported by private effort, but that "there was a marked reluctance on the part of the native community to co-operate with the State in promoting elementary vernacular education." It became necessary, therefore, for the State to take this branch of the work directly in hand. The Educational Commission of 1882, with Sir William Wilson Hunter at its head, made a thorough examination of the working of the system under the Provincial Governments, to whose control it had been in the meantime made over. On the publication of the Report of this Commission in 1883, the Government of India found that "the experience of nearly thirty years has brought to light no serious flaw in the general outlines of the policy laid down in 1854 and confirmed in 1859." Inadequate or otherwise unsatisfactory results were "almost invariably" attributable "to a departure from, or failure to act up to, the principles of the despatches upon which the whole educational system rests." The general policy and framework of education in India may, therefore, be regarded as substantially established and fixed.

Besides the annual figures of the "Moral and Material" Statement, the quinquennial reviews throw useful light on the educational movement. Two of these reviews have now been published, for 1881-82 to 1885-86, and for 1887-88 to 1891-92. In 1881-82 there were 95,566 public schools with 2,979,904 pupils; in 1891-92, there were 102,676 public schools with an attendance of 3,348,910. For the same dates, the private schools show an advance from 26,800 with 345,200 pupils, or an average of 15 each, to 39,117 with some half a million pupils, or an average of 13 each. The latest annual report shows a general increase both of schools and of pupils, but it seems impossible to extract from the unsystematic details a general statement in figures for comparison with previous years. In any case, it is obvious that there is still wide room for increase of attendance; and, on the assumption that both in 1881-82 and 1891-92 "nearly half the number" of the public schools "consists of aided lower primary schools in Bengal, the status and efficiency of which are very doubtful," and that "private schools are divided from these last by a very elastic partition," there appears to be plenty of room also for improvement in quality.

Breaking up the totals at the two ends of the decade taken for the comparison, we find that the Art students in the Universities increased nearly 60 per cent. and the Professional students (in law, medicine, engineering, and teaching) about 33 per cent. The barrier of the University entrance examination is being surmounted by ever larger numbers of students, though the enormous proportion of failures indicates either a grave misconception of the standard required or a custom of taking chance shots which practically knocks all significance out of the figures. The standard must be maintained at a reasonably high percentage, and the tests, taking one year with another, should be kept on a level, as far as this is possible. The efficiency of the University teaching is of course, conditioned by the efficiency of the Secondary grade on which it is based. The classification of the latter schools has recently been materially altered, so that it is difficult to guage the rate of progress; and the lack of uniformity in the different provinces frustrates any attempt at serviceable comparisons.

> "The same remarks (says Mr. Baines) are applicable to the results of the examinations by which the efficiency of these institutions is annually tested. The English-teaching institutions are far more in demand than those where the vernacular is the main vehicle of instruction, but there is a tendency reported in some provinces for the district school to be used more and more by only the inhabitants of the town where it is situated, and to be deserted by pupils from the rural tracts. In any case, this grade of school shows great vitality and a rapid increase in the number of its pupils."

The increase during the decade 1881-82 to 1891-92 was a little over 13 per cent. In the same period, the increase of attendance in the primary schools was very similar, amounting to nearly 12 per cent.—from 2,537,502 to 2,837,607. This stage has, of course, a double aspect: in the main, it is the complete and only course for the masses of the population; and, in the case of a small minority, it is the first step in the educational ladder. The Provinces differ in their preference for the one aspect or the other; but after all, the upper limit is practically the same, and the large majority of the pupils belong to the lower section. The most outstanding general consideration seems to be that a vast deal has yet to be done in all the Provinces to overtake the work of elementary education in a comprehensive and really effective system. The advance must, no doubt, be gradual, but the need for acceleration appears to be clamant. While the elementary schools under departmental control are, owing chiefly to local causes, subject to grievous fluctuations, the elementary private schools, outside the control of the Department appear to be deplorably inefficient.

> "The outcome of a perusal of the various provincial reports of this class (says Mr. Baines) must be the recognition of the entire want of connection between the statistics and the actual position and work of such schools. The number of institutions and pupils swells the annual tables, and does little more. In place of being buds, it has been said, which need nothing but care to bring them to a rich maturity, they ought to be considered stocks, the fruit of which cannot be improved, but must be superseded by grafts from a totally different species. There are, it is needless to say, exceptions which rise far above the ruck, and these, more often than not, are absorbed before long into the departmental system, and receive grants from public or local funds, to an extent sufficient to enable them to establish themselves firmly on an efficient as well as popular basis."

Apart from religious considerations, which unhappily militate against modern ideas, and have the advantage of tradition and custom on their side, there ought to be no difficulty in taking a wider and firmer hold on the educational problem—always excepting the pecuniary difficulty, caused and exaggerated by the persistent futilities of military demonstrations on the frontiers. The true strategic position in India is the domination of the field of primary education, bookish and practical.

The normal or training institutions, although showing an increase during the decade, appear to be in a very chaotic and feeble condition, demanding a special effort of reconstruction and invigoration. "The training of teachers," Mr. Baines remarks pointedly, "has special importance in the present time when, as the Government of India has observed, there is reason to insist on the maintenance of a stricter system of discipline than has been in force in recent years." Discipline, of course, is fundamental, but no less essential are knowledge and method. Besides, many of the so-called normal institutions seem to be little, if anything, more than primary or middle schools with a few adult pupils. Before the normal schools can be expected to flourish, there must be a more attractive career held out to prospective teachers.

The professional side of the universities developed in the decade some 33 per cent. The law course comes next to arts in popularity: "It is peculiarly in harmony with the clerical and sedentary habits of the literate classes, and involves neither physical labour, like engineering, nor the tampering with strange and possibly caste-polluting substances, like medicine and surgery." In both law and medicine, the overstocking of the large towns will force an exodus to the country districts. The practice of medicine is opening up an exceptionally hopeful career for women. For engineers a wise step was taken in 1884 by the offer of a certain number of State appointments in the Department of Public Works to certificated students of certain colleges. The full development of the higher education obviously involves the opening of the State door ever wider and wider to competent natives.

The schools for technical training (including the law, medical, and engineering schools, not of collegiate grade) have advanced during the decade from 125 to 402, and from 5,068 students to 16,125. The despatch of 1854 provided that "useful and practical knowledge suited to every station in life should be conveyed to the great mass of the people." It is since 1886, however, that a real start has been made in technical and industrial education. In agriculture, notwithstanding Dr. Voelcker's excellent certificate to the rayat's practice, and the recorded blunders of scientific interference, there is much yet to learn; and happily "the rayat is always ready to adopt an improvement, provided he has clear proof, intelligible to the ordinary bucolic mind, that he will profit by the innovation." Here there is enormous scope for development of the country. The training of the subordinate Forest Staff has recently been expanded; and here, too, there ought to be a great future. As to the mines and factories, Mr. Baines is somewhat discouraging.

> "In the remarks on mines and factories it was shown how slow must be the progress of such undertakings in a country so poorly furnished, in comparison with many others, with the raw material for starting and maintaining industry on a large scale. But education of the character in question is, practically, the supplement and auxiliary of enterprise of that sort, and though there is a fair prospect of a gradually increasing demand in India for trained skill and experience in those directions, the rate of progress is likely to be slow, so that it is out of the question, as a matter of administrative prudence, to start a system which will only end in the erection of a superfluous educated proletariat, with the same characteristics and aims as that with which, as the result of superabundant literary instruction, the State is already sufficiently embarrassed. In

the cities which are at present centres of special industries the co-operation of the managers of large workshops and factories can be secured, and there a small body of men practically trained would be in demand. This, then, is the field for technical instruction which is at present being occupied, and in every province steps have been taken in the last five years either to provide for special, or more frequently for preparatory, education on the lines sketched."

There were, in 1891-92, six schools of art with 1,048 pupils, 69 industrial schools with 3,860 pupils, and one agricultural college with 45 pupils; a total of 4,953 pupils as compared with 1,948 in 1881-82. Mr. Baines's remarks, discounted as they are by his sneers at "superabundant literary instruction," would be largely modified by a reasonable forecast of the possibilities of development that may be confidently anticipated from the present standpoint. If there is a superabundance of literary instruction it is because the natural utilisation of the commodity is dammed up by the perverse exclusiveness of officialism.

In addition to the general increase of pupils recorded in the recent "Moral and Material Statement," one would like to note a few isolated points. In Bengal, "it is satisfactory to notice that a perceptible improvement is said to be taking place in the *morale* of the pupils, and a taste for physical exercise is slowly growing up amongst the rising generation throughout the Province." "District Boards," too, "are beginning to recognise the value of technical education, and to establish industrial schools and found scholarships to enable promising pupils to finish their education at the Engineering College at Sibpur." In the Punjab, "improvement was noticed in the moral tone and discipline of the schools of all classes, and greater attention was devoted to physical training." In Burma, "the hostility to secular education which had been manifested in previous years by certain Buddhist ecclesiastics, still continues; but the number of primary schools under inspection has nevertheless increased." In the Central Provinces, while "the percentage of Hindu boys at school has kept pace with the general advance," it is especially satisfactory to learn that "that of Muhammadan boys has increased in a greater degree, and now stands at at 41·22." Madras exhibits "greater consolidation and concentration of educational effort," with results that will show their true value in coming years. In Bombay, with an increase in primary and secondary grades, "in Arts colleges, training colleges, and all special schools, there has been a slight decrease."

The importance of the position of women and and girls in the educational movement cannot be over-rated. The attitude of uneducated women in the highest native classes in Bombay is painfully exhibited in Mrs. Nikambé's most interesting sketch of "Ratanbai," which has just been published. The "Moral and Material" Statement offers the following mixed glimpses of girl pupils in the schools. In the Punjab, "the proportion of boys who attend school to those of school-going age is about 13 per cent, and of girls 1·7. . . . . In female education, there were some slight signs of progress, but the prospect was not encouraging." In the Central Provinces, "no great improvement in female education was observed, the total number of female pupils being only 6,722 or ·63 per cent. of the female population of school-going age. The proportion in the case of boys is 14 per cent." In Madras, "female education shows an advance of only 1·7 per cent., the lowest during the last five years. More stringent rules and want of funds are assigned as the causes." Against these depressing notices, we find but two small offsets. In Assam, "female education, though very backward, is making some progress"; and in Berar, "the girls' schools have improved in numbers and efficiency." The general statements are not exhilarating, whatever the definite figures might have been. When we reflect that, after all, the real education of the masses is to be sought in the elevation of their social surroundings, the state of female education is much to be deplored. There is nothing for it but patience and discreet perseverance, for the root of the difficulty is in caste and creed. We must rely on the gradual and prudent assistance of the enlightened natives of India, for the mental emancipation of their countrywomen, and therewith an unparalleled advance in solid education and social elevation. And really, when one endeavours to look from the standpoint of the Indian paterfamilias, one finds vastly more reason to be amazed at the progress that has been recently made, than to be depressed at the apparent slowness of the beneficent transformation.

A. F. Murison.

INDIAN ADMINISTRATION: A RETROSPECT.

By J. Dacosta.

It has been said that Indian affairs are rarely the subject of deliberation at Cabinet Councils; and the circumstance is easily accounted for, seeing that an Indian question has seldom caused anxiety to the Government, and never involved the fate of an Administration since 1880, when Lord Beaconsfield's Government was overturned by the British constituencies condemning his "scientific frontier" policy which landed the nation in a disastrous and humiliating war with the Afghans.

As the fate of a Cabinet depends on the decision of Parliament, it cannot, as a rule, be materially affected on an Indian question so long as India is not represented in the British legislature, and the two great political parties in the United Kingdom agree in leaving the Indian Secretary of State to deal with Indian affairs according to his own interpretation of the statutes which govern the subject. But how does the matter stand when that interpretation is flagrantly erroneous, and not only frustrates the intentions of Parliament as recorded in those statutes, but creates actual danger to our rule in India and materially injures the interests of the British nation? That such a conjuncture is neither visionary nor improbable is strikingly shown by some of the principal events which have marked our Indian administration during the last fifty years.

Our great troubles in 1857 and 1858, which are commonly spoken of as "the Indian mutinies" because mutinous Sepoys took a prominent part in initiating and spreading the movement, were in reality, as Lord Canning soon discovered and declared, a rebellion of the people against the policy of spoliation which the British Government pursued in India through the agency of Lord Dalhousie as Governor-General. Indian officials of experience and distinguished merit warned the Government of the danger which that policy had created—a policy which consisted in confiscating, upon specious and fictitious pleas and in violation of treaties and engagements, the territories and wealth of Indian sovereign princes, and in confiscating likewise the property of our own subjects on pretences equally unjustifiable. Two examples might suffice to illustrate that policy.

I. By a treaty signed in 1819, "the British Government ceded in perpetual sovereignty to the Rája of Satâra, his heirs and successors, the territories which he had previously held." Nevertheless the State of Satâra, during the incumbency of Lord Dalhousie, was seized on the plea that the late ruler had died without leaving a son to succeed to his throne, although he left an adopted son, a relative, who was his rightful heir and successor under the law of the land, and although the British Government had, in previous years, acknowledged and repeatedly acquiesced in that Oriental law.

II. The Rája of Manipur, a wealthy landowner, "the descendant of an old and honoured family, distinguished for loyalty and good service to the British Government," was dispossessed of a large portion of his lands on the report of a land-revenue officer that "the Rája was incompetent almost to the point of imbecility."[1] The truth of the fiscal officer's allegation was not tested by any judicial enquiry; and the allegation itself, be it observed, afforded no justification for depriving the Rája's family of their lawful property.

Colonel Sleeman wrote to Sir James Hogg in January 1853: "The people see that annexations and confiscations go on, and that rewards and honorary distinctions are given for them and for the victories which lead to them and for little else, and infer that they are encouraged and prescribed from home." All warnings and remonstrances, however, were disregarded, until a heavy retribution fell upon us. The rebellion broke out in May, 1857, and Englishmen and Englishwomen and their children were ruthlessly massacred at Meerut, Delhi, Cawnpore, and other British stations in India where our troubles continued for more than a year; and an appalling amount of blood and treasure was expended before peace and order were restored. The sufferers from that rebellion (if we include in the number the British-born subjects at home and in India, who lost their means of subsistence or were otherwise cruelly afflicted by it) were millions; British prestige was grievously lowered, and a public debt was incurred which still preys on the British Indian Exchequer. But the guilty authors of the spoliation scheme which had caused the mischief, escaped punishment by sheltering themselves in the defective and deceptive system of government by which India had been ruled. The powers of government in that country had been exercised ostensibly by a London Corporation—the East India Company—but in reality by a member of the British Cabinet—the President of the Board of Control—who was vested with authority to control the acts of that corporation. Thus a minister, possessing no direct or permanent interest in the good government of India, but powerfully influenced by the adverse interests of his Cabinet and his political party, became virtually the arbiter of the destinies of British India, without, at the same time, incurring the responsibilities which legitimately attach to the exercise of power, or being subjected to the restraints and obligations which the British Constitution imposes on the Executive.

After our great troubles in 1857-58 our statesmen, having arrived at the conclusion that the exercise of irresponsible power had been the originating cause of our errors and misfortunes, resolved on abolishing the East India Company and the Board of Control; on establishing High Courts for duly maintaining the administration of the law, and on creating Legislative Councils composed of official and non-official members, for discussing in public all projects of law in India. A Royal Proclamation, declaring the principles of justice which were to rule our new system of government, was at the same time considered necessary, in order to restore public confidence; and Her gracious Majesty the Queen, in commanding the Prime Minister to write out that proclamation, directed him "to bear in mind that it was a female Sovereign who spoke to more than a hundred millions of Eastern people in assuming direct government over them after a bloody war, giving her pledges which her future reign is to redeem, and explaining the principles of her government." The proclamation accordingly declared: "We hereby announce to the Native Princes of India that all treaties and engagements made with them will be scrupulously maintained. We shall respect the rights, dignity and honour of Native Princes as our own. We know and respect the feelings of attachment with which the natives of India regard the lands inherited by them from their ancestors, and we desire to protect them in all rights connected therewith, subject to the equitable demand of the State." Then referring exclusively to Her Majesty's Indian subjects, the proclamation said: "We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to our other subjects, and those obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil." Now, this solemn promise, made by a great nation through the voice of its Sovereign, has been repeatedly broken by the State officers charged with redeeming the pledges given by the Crown of England; and the nation has suffered, unconsciously no doubt, this indignity to be perpetrated, in the case of the Máhárája of Kashmir and in other instances, without protest or remonstrance.

In preparing the new system of government for India, influential politicians schemed for retaining in the hands of the British Cabinet the Indian patronage and the control of the Indian finances, which had proved valuable instruments for securing parliamentary support; they accordingly proposed that *all* the powers, which had been exercised by the East India Company and the Board of Control, should be vested in a Principal Secretary of State, subject to restrictions and safeguards calculated to prevent those powers being misused, as they had been in the previous *régime*. The safeguards were to consist—besides the establishment of High Courts and the admission of non-official members in the Legislature—of certain provisions intended (1) to debar the Indian Secretary from issuing any order which involved the expenditure of Indian revenue without the concurrence of a Council appointed to sit in London and to be composed chiefly of high Indian officials and others possessed of Indian experience, and (2) to interdict the application of any portion of the revenues of India to military operations carried on beyond the external frontiers of our Indian territories, except for repelling actual invasion or under sudden and urgent necessity. When the Bill embodying the new system was introduced in Parliament, the draft was found to be so deficient in consistency that the late Mr. John Stuart Mill denounced its clauses as utterly powerless to maintain the safeguards which the measure purported to create; and he warned the House of the danger to which the finances of India would be exposed if, when deprived of the protection they had received from the Directors of the East India Company who were strongly interested in their safety, they were placed under the control of a Cabinet Minister, without stronger and more effective safeguards than those provided by that Bill. Nevertheless the measure was passed without the necessary amendments, and it has long been patent to the world that the intended safeguards have proved illusory; that the Indian Secretary has, without the concurrence of his Council, issued orders calculated to result, and which did actually result, in very heavy expenditure in India, and that nearly £100,000,000 sterling has been expended since 1858 for carrying on military operations beyond the Indian frontier, although no invasion or sudden and urgent necessity justified the expenditure.

---

[1] Kaye's "History of the Sepoy War."

The proceedings of the Indian Secretary's Council being closed to the public, it is not known how far the independence of its members has been respected; but the curtailment of their period of office and the other changes introduced in their position since the creation of the Council, have materially impaired that independence and destroyed the safeguard which it was expected to maintain.

Then as regards the clauses intended to provide for the public discussion of legislative projects in India, they have likewise been rendered ineffectual by the Secretary of State prohibiting the introduction of Bills without his sanction, and by the official members, who form a standing majority in the Legislature, being ordered to vote, regardless of their conscience and convictions, in obedience to the instructions of the Secretary of State; while the non-official members, who have been admitted only to the extent of a small minority, are systematically excluded from the discussion of particular measures, at the option of the Government, by the Legislative Council being convened, on such occasions, to meet at Simla or in some other part of India where the non-official members cannot attend. This device, which obviously stultifies the constitution of the Council, is practiced during several months every year, and was resorted to, notably in 1873, for passing at Agra the *Northern India Rent and Revenue* Bills and the *Bombay Revenue Jurisdiction* Bill which have excluded from the cognizance of the Law Courts, all suits concerning revenue or the conduct of Revenue officers, and left such suits to be adjudicated on by Revenue officers themselves. These enactments (which violate the first principle of justice, by authorising Revenue officers to sit in judgment over their own acts, and which also infringe unrepealed enactments of the British Indian Legislature, namely Regulation II. of 1793 and other Acts) are obviously *ultra vires*; nevertheless they are maintained on the Indian Statue book, and annually facilitate the enforcement of illegal claims by the Executive. With a Legislature thus virtually converted into an office for registering, and giving the force of law to, the decrees of the Indian Secretary, the due administration of justice has disappeared from the land, except in the limited original jurisdiction of the four High Courts, and in the disposal of such appeals from subordinate tribunals as eventually reach those Courts. Meanwhile the Indian Legislature has been kept at work devising and passing measures calculated to impede all such appeals, with the effect that the influence and control of the High Courts over the subordinate tribunals have been very seriously impaired, and that the latter are, in defiance of the British Constitution, controlled in their decisions by the Executive.

Under these conditions the Act *for the better government of India*, the *Indian Councils* Act and the Act *establishing High Courts* have entirely failed to give effect to the principles enunciated in the Queen's proclamations, with the result that the policy of spoliation, which involved us in such serious troubles in 1857-58, was revived and has been actively pursued in the new *régime*, its obvious purpose at present being to assist the Indian Exchequer in defraying the continuous military operations which are being carried on in the borderland of Afghanistan.

The debate of the 5th July, 1890, on the question of "the Indian Government having taken away from the Máháraja of Kashmir the government of his State and a part of his revenues, whilst refusing to allow any Judicial or Parliamentary inquiry into the grounds of their action," lifted up a corner of the veil which concealed the practices by which the spoliation policy is pursued.

On the death of the late Máháraja of Kashmir, who is said to have left considerable private wealth, the Government of India seized the administration of his territories, offering to his son and heir to maintain his title and dignity and to pay him a stipend, provided he acquiesced in the usurpation; nor was his consent obtained until false accusations, supported by forged letters, had been brought against him, charging him with having conspired with the Russian Government, and also taken steps for compassing the death of the British Agent posted at his court. At the same time false rumours were circulated in semi-official newspapers, to the effect that he, the new Máhárája, had voluntarily abdicated the government of his State. That such practices have been resorted to under the benign rule of the British Sovereign, would be incredible, were it possible to entertain a doubt on the subject, after the debate referred to above, and the publication of all the papers relating to the case. These deplorable circumstances are referred to here for the purpose of showing the discredit and danger to our rule in India which are incurred through the inefficiency of the statutes which were intended to secure a just and honourable government in our great dependency; and of showing likewise the aberrations to which irresponsible power is liable, and the urgent necessity which now exists of arresting that great evil in India. J. Dacosta.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SURVEY DEPARTMENT IN INDIA.

By Parbati C. Roy, B.A.

Late Superintendent of Dearah Surveys and Settlements.

From no department under the Government of India are Indians so jealously excluded as from the Survey Department. Yet, as will appear from the following, they have not only proved their fitness for the work of surveying but have also shown how they could do it at even less than half the cost incurred by the Survey Department.

The Dearah, or re-survey of the banks of the Ganges in the districts of Dacca and Faridpur, was undertaken by a professional survey party in 1874-75. This was considered by Colonel J. Macdonald, superintendent of revenue survey, to be "a very difficult piece of work."[1] In the opinion of another superintendent, Colonel D. C. Vaurenen, R.A., "this (work) was certainly more difficult and involved more responsibility on the part of the executive than in the prosecution of a district survey."[2]

The following extracts from the report of the Board of Revenue and the resolution of Government thereon will show how the work was performed by the Survey Department:

> "Whatever might have been the difficulties attending the relaying on the alluvial land the boundary lines of mouzahs (villages) as shown in the old maps, it was absolutely essential that the work should be done by some one, and it is patent that the difficulties must have been greater for any unskilled agency than for the professional party with its scientific knowledge. As a fact, the professional party left undone the very work for which its services had been required."[3]
>
> "This (Dearah survey) party surveyed 952 square miles of country at a cost of Rs. 64,291. But the work done is practically valueless to the Revenue Department, and the Lieutenant-Governor must agree with Mr. Dampier (member of the Board of Revenue) that the responsibility for this rests mainly with the professional survey authorities. For the future any survey work in the Dearahs (alluvions) will be done by a non-professional party."[4]

The Dearah (alluvion) survey was thus taken out of the hands of the Survey Department, and I was entrusted with both the survey and settlement works. The following extracts from Government's administration reports and resolutions will show how the survey work was performed under me:

> "The Dearah survey in the Dacca Division, for identifying and relaying on the ground the boundaries of villages affected by river action and assessing alluvial accretions continued in charge of the deputy-collector who has been employed in the work for years past. The total cost was considerably below half of what it was when the professional department was employed, while there was no falling off in the style of work performed."[1]
>
> "The Dearah survey operations extended over a considerable portion of the Megna river, over the whole length of the Dhaleswari, and over a small portion of the Jamuna near its junction with the Puderea at Goalundo. The results were satisfactory. The excellent plans prepared by the survey party will be of the greatest utility both to the collectors of districts and the proprietors of the estates concerned."[2]
>
> "The accuracy and economy of this (Dearah) survey have been repeatedly commended, and have with the sanction of the Secretary of State been recently recognised by the grant of a personal allowance of Rs. 100 a month to the superintendent."[3]
>
> "The maps compiled by this party are remarkably accurate."[4]
>
> "The Lieutenant-Governor fully concurs in the praise bestowed by the Commissioner on the superintendent and his staff in connexion with his work."[5]
>
> "The accuracy of the Dearah survey during the year was quite up to the high standard previously attained."[6]

The following extract from the administration report for 1882-3 gives a summary of the survey conducted under my superintendence:

> "In the course of the past six years, 1877-78 to 1882-83, the banks of the chief rivers of Eastern Bengal, namely, the Ganges and Megna, with their principal branches down to the Bay of Bengal, the Dhaleswari, the Brahmaputra, and the southern portion of the Jamuna were surveyed. The total area of the tract of country surveyed in Dacca, Faridpur, Backerganje, Tipperah, Noakholly, and Maimansingh is 5,683,074 square miles, at a total expenditure of Rs. 150,450. The cost per square mile of country surveyed has, therefore, been Rs. 28-6-10. This survey has been made in the same scientific manner as the survey conducted by the Revenue Survey Department, and the accuracy of the work has been tested by connexions made with eighteen lower stations of the Great Trigonometrica Survey."[7]

In the summer of 1882, the Dearah Office was inspected by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor. In a letter dated the 2nd September, 1882, from the Secretary to the Government of Bengal to the Secretary to the Board of Revenue the following reference was made to that inspection:

> "The acknowledgments of Government are due to Baboo Parbutty Churu Roy for the very satisfactory character of the work performed by him. The Lieutenant-Governor had lately an opportunity of inspecting his office at Dacca, and found it in excellent working order and subject to efficient control. Credit is due to the Superintendent of Dearah Surveys not only for having conducted difficult survey and settlement operations under adverse circumstances successfully and cheaply, bnt also because he has trained a staff of subordinates capable of taking charge of large parties, and competent to conduct surveys on a large scale. It is probable that Government may have occasion to utilise the services of such men at no distant date."

---

[1] "Revenue Survey Report for Bengal and Behar for 1874-75," p. 9.

[2] *Ibid*, 1875-76, p. 12.

[3] "Report of the Board of Revenue on Revenue Survey Operations in the Lower Provinces for 1876-77," p. 4.

[4] "Government Resolution on the above Report," p. 2.

---

[1] "Bengal Administration Report for 1879-80," pp. 23-24.

[2] *Ibid*, 1880-81, p. 24.

[3] Government Resolution, published in the Supplement to the *Calcutta Gazette*, dated 7th September, 1881, p. 909.

[4] "Bengal Administration Report for 1881-82," p. 24.

[5] Government Resolution published in the Supplement to the *Calcutta Gazette*, dated 15th October, 1882, p. 1179.

[6] "Bengal Administration Report for 1882-83," p. 177.

[7] "Bengal Administration Report for 1882-83," p. 91.

The Dearah Survey party was, however, broken up on the completion of the work upon which it was employed, and so the experience gained by the staff of subordinates, for training whom the superintendent was praised by Government, was lost to the country.

Subsequently, at the request of the sub-committee of the Public Service Commission, I submitted a "Note" on the competence of Indians for undertaking survey operations in which I referred to the Dearah Survey conducted scientifically under me. On this "Note" Sir Edward Buck, Secretary to the Government of India in the Revenue and Agricultural Department wrote a "Note" in which he seems to have satisfied the Government as to the incompetence of Indians (natives) for superintending survey operations. I give below Sir Edward Buck's "Note" and my reply to each paragraph of it, so that the reader may judge how far the Government was justified, on the strength of this "Note," in ignoring the claims of Indians for high appointments in the survey department.

Sir E. Buck wrote[1] :—

> "The statement made by Mr. Parbati Churu Roy requires considerable modification. The work conducted by him followed upon a frame-work of boundary points fixed by the Professional Survey Department, and was therefore comparatively easy. This circumstance is referred to in Colonel Sandeman's evidence before the Public Service Commission."

I admit that there were points fixed on the banks of the Ganges by the Survey Department which were made use of by me in the course of the re-survey of those banks. But I challenge Sir Edward Buck and the Survey Department to show that there were any such points on the banks of the Megna, the Brahmaputra, and the Delleshwari which were re-surveyed by me independently of any aid from the Survey Department,, and so far as those rivers were concerned the work was *not*, therefore, comparatively easy.

> "It is, however, (Sir E. Buck continues) sufficient to say that General Walker, then Surveyor-General of India, disposed of the case by showing that the work done by the writer of the Note was only one-half the work performed by the Survey Department, and that the comparison of the rates was absolutely fallacious. As a fact, his rates were not lower than the ordinary Survey rate for such work, while his work being founded on the basis of the Survey traverses was not of any original or scientific character. In the representation made by Mr. Parbati Churu Roy the fact is not noticed that use was made of the Professional Survey."

To this I reply that Sir Edward Buck should not have rested satisfied with the statement of General Walker who was an interested party in the case. But he should have referred to the reports of the Bengal Government, which had the opportunity of judging of the comparative cost of the two works and came to the finding that my work was not half so expensive as the work done by the Survey Department. While the Survey Department did only the work of surveying I did both the work of surveying and of settlement. It will appear from the following extract from my "Note" to the Sub-Committee of the Public Service Commission that I stated in the clearest possible manner what use I had made of the Professional Survey maps and traverses. In fact the Dearah Survey having been a re-survey of banks affected by fluvial action, it was absolutely necessary for determining the changes since the first Survey, that the maps and traverses of that Survey should be consulted :—

"The Dearah Survey had been declared by Lieutenant-Colonel J. MacDonald, Officiating Superintendent of Revenue Surveys, to be 'a very difficult piece of work,' and Colonel D. C. Vaurenen, R.A., Superintendent of Revenue Surveys expressed it as his opinion that this work was certainly more difficult and involved more responsibility on the part of the executive than in the prosecution of a District Survey. I was, therefore, very anxious to submit my work to all possible kinds of test. With this view I not only compared my maps with the Revenue Survey maps of the first survey which were obtainable at the Office of the Collectors of Districts, but I also obtained the traverse data of the first survey from the office of the Surveyor-General in Calcutta. I further obtained from the Superintendent of the great Trigonometrical Survey at Dehra Dun the triangulation Charts of the Eastern Calcutta Longitudinal Series and the Brahmaputra Series, in order to compare the distance between any two of the Great Trigonometrical Tower stations connected with my survey as obtained from my calculation papers with the distance of the same two stations as shown in the Triangulation Charts. My object in making this comparison was to subject my survey to what is called by Colonel Thuillier in his manuel of surveying 'the most severe test to which a Revenue Survey can be subjected.'"

Sir Edward Buck is, therefore, incorrect in his statement that I did not notice in my "Note" the fact that "use was made of the Professional Survey."

Again Sir E. Buck writes :

> "The merits of survey work conducted under native superintendence were very fully discussed by the Bengal authorities in anticipation of the Behar Survey in the year 1884. The opinions of many officers were taken, and Parbati Churu Roy himself was permitted to submit a long note on the subject. The Bengal Government, however, decided (in a letter of 25th October, 1884) that the Survey must be conducted under professional agency and Mr. Parbati Churu Roy's claims were practically put on one side, in complete concurrence with the views and policy of the Government of India as expressed in its resolution on survey in 1882."

I am not aware on what grounds my "claims were put on one side," by the Bengal Government in 1884, but, if it was on the ground that the Dearah Survey under me had been badly done, the Government contradicted its own repeated commendations of it quoted in a previous part of this article. But that there could not have been a change in its views as regards the merits of my survey is proved by the fact that Government lately granted me a special pension in consideration of this very work. In his letter dated the 7th April, 1894, Her Majesty's Under Secretary of State describes it as having been "excellent and conspicuous." Why then, it might be asked, were my claims "put on one side at the Behar survey?" The explanation of this is furnished by Sir Edward Buck himself. The Bengal Government in having the Dearah Survey done independently of the Survey Department was acting against the "views and policy" of the Government of India, which were the views and policy of Sir Edward Buck and his friends of the Survey Department. What those "views and policy" were will appear from a Memorandum by Colonel de Pree, Officiating Surveyor-General, which was dragged into light in the course of the proceedings of the Public Service Commission. This Chief of the Survey Department considered it "suicidal for the Europeans to admit that natives can do any one thing better than themselves," and held that the "Europeans should claim to be superior in everything and allow natives to take a secondary or subordinate part." The reason why "natives" are not allowed to do the work reserved for Europeans and Eurasians is also stated by the gallant Colonel. "In my old parties," says he, "I never permitted a native to touch a theodolite or an original computation on the principle that the triangulation or scientific work was the prerogative of the highly-paid Europeans, and this reservation of the scientific work was the only way by which I could keep up a distinction so as to justify the different figures of pay respectively drawn by the two classes, between the European in office time and the natives who ran him so close in all the office duties as well as in field duties."[1] As a rule English officers of Government are very guarded in their language and do not commit themselves in this manner. But Colonel de Pree did not mean that his memorandum, which was intended as a piece of advice for his European subordinates, should see the light of day. The Indians who were suspected of having first furnished it to the Press were heavily punished with suspension and degradation. The views expressed by Colonel de Pree are, however, the views cherished in their heart of hearts by almost all Englishmen whose interests clash with those of Indians.

---

[1] Sub-Committee's proceedings, p. 26.

The Bengal Government that fought so strenuously and successfully against the Survey Department in 1877 might, it is true, have held out in 1884. But there was not only a change in the *personnel* of the Government, but there was a change also in that of the Board of Revenue. The powerful aid of Sir Ashley Eden (Lieutenant-Governor) and the warm support and hearty sympathy of Mr. H. L. Dampier (Member, Board of Revenue) which led me on to victory in 1877 were wanting in 1884.

Finally, Sir E. Buck says:

> "The Dearah Survey proves in fact little or nothing. The work was not of a very high class character, and does not of itself show whether a Native officer would have been capable of higher-class work. But, as a matter of fact, Mr. Parbati Churn Roy was an untrained Native, and therefore just as unfit for the conduct of important survey work as an untrained European. There is no officer of the Survey Department who would have been competent to take charge of a Revenue Survey party without some years' apprenticeship, and there is no reason to suppose that a Native, however able, can, any more than our professional officers, undertake important Survey work without adequate training."

Now, the Dearah Survey proves in fact a great deal more than Sir Edward Buck is disposed to admit. It proves that an Indian had conducted surveys which, while in the hands of the Professional Survey Department, had been considered by both Colonel J. MacDonald and Colonel D. C. Vaurenen, Superintendents of Surveys, to be more difficult than ordinary district work. Of course, its character changed with the change of hands. What was difficult in the hands of Europeans became easy when transferred to those of an Indian. The argument, based on my alleged want of training and experience, is not a new one. It was taken up by the Survey Department so far back as 1877, when the Superintendent of Revenue Surveys said "that the survey had been well and carefully done, and that the Settlement Officer [meaning myself] did not know how to utilise the numerous boundary marks set up by the Survey."[1] But after I had shown, by referring to their own maps, the shortcomings of the Survey Department, the Bengal Government "put on one side" the charge of incompetence brought against me by that department, and the Government of India in those days concurred in the view taken by the Local Government. Sir Edward Buck had no opportunity of judging as to my training or efficiency, and as I had correctly performed one scientific survey it would have been fair on the part of Government to have tried me in another survey before my claims were put on one side; especially as I offered to perform the new work not independently of but in conjunction with the Survey Department. The Dearah survey proves in a most conclusive manner that an Indian *can* conduct and *has* actually conducted a difficult piece of survey work, cheaply and efficiently, independently of the Survey Department.

It might be asked, how could the work be done so cheaply and accurately by an *Indian?* The answer to this is very simple. I made use of the trained agency supplied by the surveying school of Dacca and the civil engineering college of Shibpur (Calcutta). My sub-surveyors and assistant surveyors, unlike those of the Survey Department, joined their work with not only a knowledge of the principles of surveying, but with practical field training as well. As a matter of fact, my assistants had received higher mathematical and scientific training at the engineering college than the European and Eurasian assistants of the Survey Department are required to possess on entering the service. And yet the former were paid only one-fourth the salary paid to the latter. Another reason why the cost was less was because, instead of two separate parties—one for survey and the other for settlement work, I had only one party for doing both the works.

I am no longer in active service, but four of my late assistants hold the posts of deputy-collectors and deputy-magistrates, and their services in survey work are still available to Government. If the Government honestly desires economy in the Survey Department it should try these officers with some survey work. If, on the other hand, it deliberately intends to reserve the Survey Department for Europeans and Eurasians let it boldly say so, and not resort to arguments which will not hold water. The administration of the Survey Department furnishes a most fitting illustration of the unfair and unjust treatment by Government of the claims of Indians for high appointments in their country, when they have proved their fitness for them in spite of difficulties thrown in their way by interested Anglo-Indians.

---

[1] "Sub-Committee's Proceedings," p. 23.

[1] Bengal Revenue Board's Survey Report for 1877-8, p. 3.

If the "blacks" are, at present, not fit to be placed in independent charge of survey parties, let them be appointed as "assistants" with prospects of rising higher, through good service. Let the door of competition be thrown open equally to "blacks" and "whites," and the salaries of the various grades be fixed not with a view to accommodate the "whites," but to secure the men best fitted for the work. It will then be found that the "blacks" will enter the Survey on half the salaries now paid to the "whites," but with superior scientific and mathematical knowledge.

I am reluctant to write an article which deals with matters in which I was, at one time, personally interested. But the information herein supplied is of a special nature, and, though gathered from official documents, is known to few.

Parbati C. Roy.

INDIAN CANDIDATES FOR PARLIAMENT.

ADDRESSES OF MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AND MR. W. C. BONNERJEE.

The following is the text of the address issued by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji to the electors of Central Finsbury:

Gentlemen and Fellow Electors,

In my address to you at the last Parliamentary election in July, 1892, when you did me the honour of electing me as your representative in the House of Commons, I promised that—

> "Should you do me the honour to return me, I will devote all my time to Parliamentary duties, and your local wants and interests shall have my especial attention."

Both of these promises I have faithfully fulfilled to the very letter, as will be seen by the following record:

In 1892 there was only one division in Parliament, and I voted in it.

In 1893-4 the Session was divided into two parts. In the first part there were 310 divisions, and I voted in 304 of them.

During the second part of the Session I visited India, carrying with me your generous and kind message given through the Council of the Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association. This journey necessitated a short absence.

In 1894 there were 246 divisions, and of these I voted in 231.

In 1895 there were 139 divisions, and of these I voted in 118.

It was only when my attendance was required at some function in Clerkenwell, or when engaged in advancing the Liberal cause in some other way, that I was absent from any division. But as even in my few personal absences from the division lobby I was always paired, not a single vote was ever lost by the constituency.

In my Committee work also I have been as closely attentive.

With regard to my second promise—the local wants and interests of Clerkenwell have always had my prompt, earnest, and careful attention.

I have thus fulfilled my pledges, and for which, I gratefully acknowledge, you several times generously expressed your entire satisfaction. I cannot, therefore, but hope that you will return me again with a large majority.

Within the limits of this address it would be impossible to do adequate justice to the great and good work accomplished by the Liberal and Radical party during the last three years, but I may be permitted to point out that, despite all the continuous obstructive opposition of its opponents, the Government has to their credit as having passed 73 Public Acts and 229 Local and Private Acts in 1893-4; 68 Public Acts and 216 Local and Private Acts were passed in 1894, while up to 21st June in 1895, 17 Public Acts passed, and 16 Bills passed in the House of Commons; and 8 Local and Private Acts have been passed; and 39 Bills passed in the House of Commons.

In 1892 the Liberal Party was returned with a majority to carry out the reforms included in what is known as the Newcastle Programme, and the way this party has fulfilled its mandate has been described by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain in the following words:

> "I do not think that in the history of our legislation for the last twenty years you can find any Parliament in which more has been done as to the importance of the Bills which have been passed" (18th July, 1894).

The next day the *Times* said in its leader: "Few Governments have passed a greater body of important legislation in a single Session."

The Home Rule Bill, the Budget of 1894, the Parish Councils Act, the Employers Liability Bill, the Factory and Workshops Bill (expected to pass), may well evoke such testimony, and will remain monuments of beneficial Liberal statesmanship.

We are generally apt to fix our attention on the great Acts, but we have also to remember much useful legislation which affects our everyday life and comfort. I append a list of some of the Acts passed, from which it will be seen that the tendency and spirit of all this legislation has been the promotion of the welfare of the masses of the people, and of labour particularly, which is the backbone or foundation of all national wealth and greatness. Over and above actual legislation much reform has been effected departmentally and by resolutions.

Though thus, a good deal of beneficent, progressive, and important legislation has been done, much of the great Newcastle Programme still remains to be carried. It follows that all Liberal and Radical electors should exercise their sovereign power, and send back the Liberal party to carry through successfully the great work which was entrusted to them in 1892. I shall state a few of the items of progressive and important work which is still before us.

For the Irish Home Rule, the Liberal party are bound by every duty of honour, and even by self-interest. It will be one of those glorious landmarks of civilisation in British history with which it is replete during the present century. The Welsh Disestablishment; Home Rule for London in all its various important requirements; the restriction of the Veto of the House of Lords, if not its Abolition; Taxation of Land Values for National and Municipal Purposes (a Bill for the latter purpose has been twice introduced by me); Division of Rates between Owners and Occupiers; Payment of Members; Perfect and Easy Registration of Electors by Responsible Public Registration Officers; One Man One Vote; Residential Adult Suffrage; Eight Hours; Direct Popular Veto of the Liquor Traffic, and many other important Liberal Measures.

It is the Liberal party who has mainly done, or forced the Conservatives to do, progressive legislation; and it is from the Liberal or Progressive party alone that we can expect such legislation in the future.

India.

Lastly, I address a few words about India. The electors of Central Finsbury have inaugurated a great and brilliant chapter in the already great history of the British people, by holding out their generous and kind hand of common fellowship to their Indian fellow-subjects, and I trust the electors will renew that noble and generous act in the present election by returning me again.

When I visited India in 1893-4 the people of India, of all classes and creeds, gave me a reception the like of which has not been, it is said, witnessed in living memory, in its vast extent, spontaneity and enthusiasm, with an expression of gratitude, deep and sincere, towards the electors of Central Finsbury—a name which is a household world throughout India.

I content myself with appending the expressions of sentiments that have taken place both in Central Finsbury and in India towards each other. The sentiments of gratitude to the electors in all parts of India which I visited, were similar to and reflected in the resolution of the Indian National Congress.

During the three years I have been your representative in the House of Commons, I have experienced at your hands uniform courtesy and kindness, and I take this opportunity of making my sincere acknowledgments for the same.

Trusting that you will continue your generous confidence in me, and return me again as your Member to the House of Commons,

I have the honour to be, yours faithfully,

D. Naoroji.

8, Percival Street, Clerkenwell, E.C., and National Liberal Club, Whitehall, S.W. *5th July*, 1895.

APPENDIX REFERRED TO IN MY FOREGOING ADDRESS.—D.N.

A Message from India,

Being a Resolution passed at the meeting of the Great Indian National Congress at Nagpur, December 30th, 1891:

"That this Congress hereby puts formally on record its high estimate and deep appreciation of the great services which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has rendered, during more than a quarter of a century to the cause of India, that it expresses its unshaken confidence in him, and its earnest hope that he may prove successful at the coming elections in his candidature for Central Finsbury; and at the same time tenders, on behalf of the vast population it represents, India's most cordial acknowledgments to all in England, whether in Central Finsbury or elsewhere, who have aided or may aid him to win a seat in the House of Commons."

India's Thanks in 1892.

Eighth Indian National Congress, held at Alláhábad on 28th, 29th, and 30th December, 1892:

Resolved, that this Congress most respectfully and cordially tenders, on behalf of the vast population it represents, India's most heartfelt thanks to the electors of Central Finsbury for electing Mr. D. Naoroji their Member in the House of Commons. And it again puts on record its high estimate and deep appreciation of the services which that gentleman has rendered to this country, reiterates its unshaken confidence in him, and looks upon him as India's representative in the House of Commons.

The Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association send a Greeting to the forthcoming Indian National Congress, 1893.

The Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association, in view of Mr. Naoroji's visit to India at the end of November next, have passed the following Resolution:

"1. That the General Council of the Central Finsbury United Liberal and Radical Association desire to record their high appreciation of the admirable and most exemplary manner in which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has performed his duties as representative of this constituency in the House of Commons, and, learning that he is, in the course of a few months, to visit India to preside over the Ninth Session of the Indian National Congress, request him to communicate to that body an expression of their full sympathy alike with all the efforts of that Congress for the welfare of India, and with the Resolution which has been recently passed by the House of Commons (in the adoption of which Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has been so largely instrumental) in favour of holding Simultaneous Examinations in India and in Britain of candidates for all the Indian Civil Services; and further express the earnest hope that full effect will, as speedily as possible, be given by the Government to this measure of justice which has been already too long delayed.

"2. That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. "(Signed) Joseph Walton,

"*Chairman of Meeting.*"

India's Thanks.

Resolved,—That this Congress tenders its best thanks to the electors of Central Finsbury, both for their kindly sympathy in its objects, and for having so generously accorded to it the valuable services of their honoured member Mr. Naoroji, who is destined, the Congress hopes, long to represent both Central Finsbury and India in the British House of Parliament.

Some Acts relating to the United Kingdom passed in 1893.

Trade Union Provident Funds, Police Disabilities Removal, Municipal Corporations, Weights and Measures, Public Works Loans, Railway Regulation, Friendly Societies, Prevention of use of Barbed Wire in Road Fences, Conveyance of Mails, Industrial and Provident Societies, Public Works Loans, Education of Deaf and Blind Children, Public Health Act (London, 1891) Amendment, Elementary Education School Attendances, Statute Law Revision, Metropolis Management (Plumstead and Hackney), Company's Winding-up, Married Women's Property, Shop Hours Regulation, Hospital Isolation, Savings Banks, Parish Councils Acts, Day Industrial Schools (Scotland), Local Authorities' Loans (Scotland), Reformatory Schools (Scotland), Burgh Police (Scotland), Improvement of Land (Scotland), Burghs Gas Supply (Scotland), Cholera Hospitals (Ireland), Congested District Boards (Ireland), Law of Distress and Small Debts (Ireland), Irish Education, County Surveyors (Ireland), and Light Railways (Ireland).

Some Public Acts in 1894.

Industrial and Provident Societies, Trustee Act (1893) Amendment, Public Works Loans, Merchandise Marks' Prosecutions, Commissioners of Works, Wild Birds' Protection, Outdoor Relief, Friendly Societies, Prevention of Cruelty to Children (Amending Clauses), Registration of Electors' Acceleration, Industrial Schools' Act Amendments, Charitable Trusts, Prize Courts, Regulation of Quarries, Building Societies' Amendments Act, Coal Mines' Check Weighers, London Equalisation of Rates, Railway and Canal Traffic, Housing of the Working Classes, Merchant Shipping.

The above are only some of the Acts passed.

The following is the text of the address issued by Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee to the electors of Barrow-in-Furness:

GENTLEMEN,

It having been definitely announced by the newly-appointed Government that the present Parliament will be dissolved in a short time, I, in response to the invitation of the Radical party in the Borough, solicit your suffrages to be returned as your member in the next House of Commons.

By conviction I am a Radical, and if you should honour me by your confidence and place me in the proud position of your representative, I will by vote and voice do all I can to help the Radical party in giving effect to the remaining items of what have now become household words, namely, "The Newcastle Programme."

I am strongly opposed to the power at present possessed by the House of Lords, a non-elective hereditary chamber, of vetoing measures coming up from the people's house, and I, will support any measure that may be brought forward by the responsible leaders of our party to put an end to such power.

I view with great satisfaction the fact that our leaders have earnestly taken up the temperance question by introducing the Local Veto Bill in the present House of Commons, and being an ardent advocate of temperance, will strenuously support any measure on similar lines.

The policy of Lord Rosebery's Government in regard to Welsh Church Disestablishment has my strong support, and I will strive to see it carried into effect and extended to other Church establishments.

The working classes have my strongest sympathy, and I am distinctly of opinion that their hours of labour ought to be shortened, without interfering in any way with their wages.

Mining Royalties should, in my opinion, be very considerably reduced.

I am a thorough supporter of Home Rule for Ireland, and not only that, but of Home Rule for England, Wales and Scotland also.

I am also in favour of "one man, one vote," and of large reforms in the laws for the registration of voters.

And, finally, it will be my aim to help to reform the procedure of the House of Commons in such a way that these and other Radical measures may be passed into law without unnecessary delay.

I am, Gentlemen, your obedient servant.

W. C. BONNERJEE.

Bedford Park, Croydon, *July 4th*, 1895.

The Hon. William Frederick Barton Massey-Mainwaring, the Conservative who defeated Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in Central Finsbury, is the fifth son of the third Lord Clarina, of Clarina, county Limerick, by his marriage with Susan Elizabeth, daughter of Mr. Hugh Barton, of Straffan, county Kildare. He was born on May 25th, 1845, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, which he entered in 1862, and where he graduated B.A. in 1866 with high honours as senior of the junior moderators, with the silver medal in experimental physics, chemistry, geology, and botany. He entered as a student at the Inner Temple in 1865, and was called to the Bar in 1868, having previously taken the degree of LL.B. at Dublin. He is (says the *Daily News*) an amateur art expert and collector, and lent his collection of some 4,000 art objects to the Bethnal Green Museum. He has also lent his collection of pictures to Glasgow, Derby, Leeds, Sheffield, and elsewhere, and has been a constant lender of pictures to the Old Masters' Burlington House Winter Exhibition, the People's Palace, etc. Also a scientist and social and sanitary reformer. He owns estates in Durham, Yorkshire, and Lincolnshire, for which latter county he is a D.L. He is also well known in city circles as being or having been connected with numerous companies. He married in 1872 Isabella Ann, widow of the late Major-General Egerton C. W. M. Milman, and only child of the late Mr. Charles Benjamin Lee-Mainwaring, of the Old Palace, Richmond, Surrey, and on the demise of his father-in-law assumed the additional name of Mainwaring by royal licence in 1874. He is on the committee of the Junior Carlton Club, was for many years an active member of its library committee, and is a member of the Burlington Fine Arts and many other clubs. He unsuccessfully contested Norwich in 1880, and was the advanced Conservative candidate for Central Hackney at the General Election of 1892, but retired before the nomination in order that the party should not be divided.

Commenting on the defeat of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the *Manchester Guardian* said (July 17th): Probably there is no single contest at this general election the result of which will be felt as a serious personal loss by so large a number of British subjects as the election in Central Finsbury.

The *Daily News* wrote on July 17th: The defeat of Mr. Rowlands is a notable instance of popular ingratitude. It is almost equally unfortunate that Mr. Naoroji has been rejected in Central Finsbury. His presence in the House of Commons has given so much satisfaction to the people of India, and he has shown such marked fidelity to Liberal principles that his failure must be regarded as a public calamity.

The *Standard* wrote: In North-East Bethnal Green Mr. Bhownaggree has displaced that well-known Labour Leader, Mr. George Howell; while, conversely, in Central Finsbury, Mr. Naoroji has been dismissed in favour of Mr. Mainwaring. India is thus represented in the House of Commons by one who can really claim to be a native, and who, like most of his intelligent countrymen, is a sincere believer in Imperial unity.

On July 24th a crowded meeting of Liberal electors, convened by the Central Finsbury Liberal and Radical Association, was held at the Parochial Schools, Anwell Street, Clerkenwell, Mr. Joseph Walton presiding. Acknowledging a cordial vote of thanks for his past services, Mr. Naoroji said that, despite the result of the late contest, he believed that democratic Clerkenwell was as true as ever to the cause of popular progress, and that Central Finsbury would yet vindicate her faith in her long-held principles of Liberalism and Radicalism. He would not stop to discuss the causes that brought about the temporary defeat of the Liberal candidate—(Cries of "Beer and Bung," and shouts of "Wholesale Tory treating in the public-houses")—but as a fellow-elector and their former member, he asked them to rally round the old flag once more, and not to give way to despair or despondency. The time was not far distant when Central Finsbury would resume her old place in the ranks of the army of progress and political advancement. (Loud cheers.)

LORD SANDHURST AT POONA.

ADDRESS FROM THE SARVAJANIK SABHA.

An important deputation representing the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha waited upon Lord Sandhurst, the recently appointed Governor of Bombay, at Poona on June 15th. The deputation consisted of Babu Sahib Kurundwadkar, vice-president, Babu Máháraj, Messrs. V. M. Bhide, Narayanbhai Dha, Dorabji Dadabhai Butti, Kupuswamny Mudaliar, Chintaman Rao Kashinath Natu, Bal Gungadur Tilak, and G. K. Gokhale. The following address was read by the hon. secretary, Mr. G. K. Gokhale:—

To his Excellency the Right Honourable Lord Sandhurst, G.C.I.E., Governor of Bombay.

May it please your Excellency,—On behalf of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha—a body established twenty-five years ago to represent to Government the wants and wishes of the people of the Deccan—we beg respectfully to offer your Excellency a most hearty and loyal welcome to this historic city of Poona. The selection of your Excellency to preside over our destinies for the next five years was hailed everywhere with feelings of satisfaction and thankfulness, because among other things, of the connection of your distinguished father and uncle with this Presidency and the high esteem in which their names are still held here by the people. The hopeful anticipations thus formed were further strengthened by the declaration which your lordship was pleased to make on the eve of your setting out for India—a declaration which was received with special satisfaction by the people of this Presidency—that during your administration it would be your ambition to walk in the footsteps of the great Mountstuart Elphinstone. The high purpose which prompted such a declaration has already created a feeling not merely of hope but also of faith about the beneficent character of your lordship's regime, and even in the brief period that has elapsed since your lordship's accession to office, events have happened to show that this faith has not been misplaced.

2. It afforded us great satisfaction to see how conscientiously and quietly your Excellency utilised your short stay in Bombay by personally visiting its public institutions and making yourself acquainted with those who had the management of its schools and colleges, hospitals and mills. Your courteous invitation to the Bombay Corporation to submit their views on the police question still under discussion produced also a happy effect on the public mind. Your Excellency's visit to Poona in March last to open the Fergusson College buildings, the inconvenience with which you so readily put up on the occasion with a view to meet the wishes of the Deccan Education Society that the opening ceremony should be performed on the Hindu new year's day, and the sympathetic assurance which you gave on the occasion about the policy of Government in regard to higher education have been very widely appreciated all over the Presidency. Last, but not least, the concession of the elective franchise to the Local Boards of the Central Division has filled the public mind with the liveliest sense of gratitude. The Sabha gladly takes this opportunity of tendering to your Excellency the most grateful thanks of the people of the Deccan for thus doing justice to their claims at the earliest opportunity available and thereby removing all cause for complaint in the matter.

3. Among the subjects which have engaged the public mind for some time past, and to which the Sabha would now respectfully invite your lordship's attention, is the delay which had taken place in the settlement of the question of the constitution of the new Provincial Service. The draft rules intended to regulate first admissions to this Service have now been under consideration for more than three years. The rules already drafted by the Bombay Government have created a wide feeling of dissatisfaction and alarm. The Provincial Service has been brought into existence to "do full justice to the claims of the natives of India to higher and more extended employment in the public Service," and it is proposed to amalgamate with it some of the higher posts reserved for Covenanted Civil Servants. It is, therefore, a matter of the first importance that the men who are appointed to it should possess, as recommended by the Public Service Commission, the highest educational qualifications available in this country. "As the conditions of admission," the Commission observed, "to the Imperial Service aim at high English qualifications, so the conditions of admission to the Provincial Service should be framed with a view to secure the best qualifications obtainable in India." And again: "the qualifications required for admission to the Provincial Service must be such as to give fair promise that the candidates admitted to it will, in time, be fit to discharge the duties of high appointments formerly belonging to the Covenanted Service, but now to be amalgamated with the Provincial Service, to which members of the Provincial Service will ordinarily in due course be promoted." The London examination for the Indian Civil Service is one of the stiffest competitive examinations in the world, and if men possessing qualifications inferior even to those of an Indian undergraduate—for the proposed competitive examination for the Provincial Service is simpler than even the Matriculation test of our Universities—are appointed to posts usually held by Covenanted Civil Servants, it would be obviously impossible for these men to enjoy the same consideration at the hands of Government or be held by the people in the same esteem. Passing a high educational test, again, does not merely indicate a certain amount of intellec-

tual development only. It also implies a developed moral sense and an awakened feeling of sympathy with the mass of the population, without which no officer, however able, can properly discharge the duties of his office. The Sabha, therefore, respectfully prays that your Excellency's Government will be pleased to reconsider this matter. If the cost proposed at present is allowed to stand as it is, the Sabha feels convinced that the failure of the Provincial Service is as certain as that of the Statutory Service. Another defect in the proposed rules which has caused serious dissatisfaction is the proposal to distribute the posts to be thrown open to competition on the principle of races and castes. Such a principle directly violates the assurances solemnly given to the people of this country from time to time, viz., that in making appointments to the public Service, "fitness alone will be the criterion of eligibility," and that "whatever other tests of qualifications may be adopted, distinctions of race and religion shall not be among the number." If the proposal is intended to help the advance of what are called the backward classes, we humbly submit that this advance can be secured not by conferring members of these classes appointments for which they may not be fit and thereby impairing general administrative efficiency, but only by giving them special facilities to come up educationally in a line with the more advanced sections of the community. The Sabha, therefore, ventures respectfully to hope that your Excellency will yet be able to save the Presidency from the demoralising results that must arise from the adoption of these rules.

4. Another subject to which the Sabha would humbly invite your Lordship's attention is the great hardship and misery caused by the revision settlements lately effected, more especially in parts of the Colaba and Ratnagiri Districts. The so-called Settlement Department unsettles men's minds by reason of the total absence of all fixed principles which regulate its work beyond a desire to bring more revenue. It unsettles the relations of lands, disappoints industry of its just expectations, and turns what is intended to be a tax on rents into a tax on capital and on the wages of the hard-pressed agriculturist. The Department does not observe the rules laid down for its guidance and always makes out special cases for exception. The enhancements on individual holdings are really those which concern individual rayats, and these are too often raised far above the limits laid down by Government for its guidance. Even the Taluka and village limits are similarly transgressed. The total increase in the case of Panvel and Alibag Talukas has been about 45 per cent. instead of 33 per cent. The pledge, not to tax improvements made by holders, is also often-times violated and the persons aggrieved have no legal remedy or redress. In the Devgad Taluka of Ratnagiri, the revision settlement have pratically resulted in a confiscation of the property of many of the khots, the assessment now demanded being considerably in excess of the total rents due to the khots from their tenants. In Panwell Pen and other Talukas, the taxing of varkas lands separately has worked prejudicially in the same manner. The suffering caused by these operations of the Survey Department is so acute that it is imperatively necessary for Government to adopt measures of relief without further delay.

5. The question of Hindu-Muhammadan riots is also one in regard to which the public mind is not yet free from anxiety. The views of the Sabha on this subject have been exhaustively set forth in two memorials submitted by it to your Lordship's predecessor some months ago. The present peaceful disposition of the parties should in the opinion of the Sabha, be taken advantage of for the adoption of the measures suggested therein to ensure permanent relations of amity and goodwill between the parties, especially the amendment of the Police Laws which place unnecessarily large powers in the hands of the police officers in the matter of regulating processions and music, and the formation of Conciliatory Boards on the lines on which they have been formed by the North-West Provinces Government.

6. The question of forests is also one of great urgency, as it affects seriously the interests of the poorest population. The wise and sympathetic policy embodied in the recent resolution of the Government of India on forest administration leaves nothing to be desired, if effect is given to it by a change in the rules. The Sabha prays that these rules will be framed in a liberal spirit and that Government will not allow the Department to be worked as a means of increasing revenue from its monopoly so much as of real conservancy of the needs of the agricultural classes, providing free grazing for their cattle of all kinds without distinction and securing their contentment by disforesting nominal forests in barren plains and by restricting strict checks only to those parts where the preservation of trees is likely to be of general benefit by preventing the silting of rivers and streams.

These are some of the subjects to which the Sabha ventures to respectfully invite your Excellency's attention on this occasion. The Sabha is deeply sensible of your Excellency's kindness and condescension in accepting this humble address of welcome, and it trusts that your lordship's rule in this Presidency will bring increased progress and prosperity and contentment to the people committed by Her Gracious Majesty to your care.

EMPIRE OF INDIA EXHIBITION. II.

(BY OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.)

PASSING over the bridge across the West London Extension Railway, one enters that part of the Exhibition which is most distinctively Indian. To the left, the Empress Theatre is building. It will be a colossal theatre, capable of seating 5,000 people, as a foreman-of-works told me, and with a stage that will hold 1,500 performers. The span of the roof is 220 feet, the height from the ground to the top of the lantern, 117 feet. Needless to say, this is not yet finished, but probably will be during August.

Since it is a closed door, we must pass the police office at the foot of the stair, the electric-lighting station on the left; pass through the fine Imperial Court with its beautiful colonnade, and enter the Indian city by the Maidan Gate. There is a well in the midst of the Maidan into which everybody peeps, but no one has yet explained its *raison d'être.* Of course it must be ornamental. The absorbing interest of the Maidan is centred on the animals, which always delight a British crowd. First, there are tiny bullocks, about the size of goats, drawing charming little carts with places for children. Then there are camels grunching and grutching all day long (what *is* the noise a camel makes?). They are elegantly bedizened, but evidently dress appeals to no weakness in them. Possibly they are male camels. Anyhow, they survey the British public with a diabolical expression, and scatter it right and left by suddenly breaking forth into vocal utterance. Each camel has to carry four passengers, which may explain his disgust at the Exhibition. At first he used to kneel down to receive his load, but a kind-hearted gentleman wrote to the papers representing the kneeling as insult added to injury. Although the camels' knees were thoroughly well padded, the management hastened to meet the gentleman's wishes, and now there is a tall platform to which the camels' victims (threepence each) climb. The thing is, and the camel knows the plot quite well, not to leave the platform until you are perfectly certain that you will land on one of the shelves on the animal's side. Always he is sheering off at the critical moment, followed by a scream of terror from a would-be passenger, howls and shouts on the part of the camel-drivers, laughter and amusement of the spectators. The drivers are of course Indian, fully alive to the fact that their khakee-costumes are immensely becoming, their turbans things of beauty and joys for ever.

But interest in camels pales before British delight in the elephant lōg. I have seen a Hindu doing puja before the Queen's statue at Bombay. Similarly, the British do puja at the elephant verandah, all agape. Close to the Maidan Gate are four young elephants. They are small compared with what one can see in India, but they atone for this defect by sagacity and affection for the public.

Should a lady appear round the elephant corner with a paper bag in her hand, instantly at least two probosces are eagerly exploring it. Should it be opened, the quartette become extraordinarily attentive, in the literal sense of the word. With true British justice, such as Indians are well acquainted with, she deals out a piece all round, every proboscis closely following. The last man eats the paper bag, smiling pleasantly all the time.

One woman was so misguided as to climb on the elephant's back, her paper bag still unopened. He knew it was there. Playfully he jerked up his proboscis, laying it on his broad, noble brow, then suddenly whipping it into his mouth, just to show her that the trick could be managed, even from her lofty elevation. Either she was indifferent or her sense of humour obtuse, for, after a dozen wasted efforts, he had to drag her round the compound unrewarded, unless she relented later. If you have no paper bag, the elephant will sniff you all over just to assure himself of the fact. A little further off are two much bigger elephants, awaiting the construction of howdahs fitted to their build. They stand in the Haidarabad bazaar.

In the centre of the Indian city, perhaps just to illustrate what some Englishmen are supposed to think about Indian cities, is Rowland Ward's jungle. When an Englishman goes to the jungle, he considers his merits insufficiently assessed if he wastes his sweetness on the desert air at a lower rate than 500 rupees *per mensem*, paid punctually on the 1st. The chief difference between the real jungle and Rowland Ward's, filled with stuffed lions, tigers, hunters, ibex, Himalayan sheep, crocodiles, elephants, is that you must pay sixpence to enter the latter. Still, as you can leave when you please, without trouble about furlough, the advantages are most likely all on the side of the exhibition jungle.

Round the jungle are native shops, with real Indians inside, busy at work or pretending to be so, and all dressed in their best as if they were just off to a religious festival on the banks of the Ganges. Here is a dyer with all his pots ranged in front, samples of his skill hanging on a cord at the back. Then there are wood turners, wood carvers, engravers, glass blowers, sweetmeat makers, an embroiderer, weavers, potters, brass and copper workers, fancy slipper makers, smiths and jewellers. There is more sameness than in a real Indian city, but at the same time more cleanliness and no flies at all. To see an Indian bazaar without flies is like "Hamlet" without the Prince of Denmark in it, only the artistic effect is not marred, and one lingers longer in consequence. The carving on the outside of the chowkis and balcony arrangements are often effective and pleasing; especially does the shop of Juma Alladdeen and Mohamed Baksh deserve to be praised for its artistic appearance. Afterwards I spoke to the manager and reminded him that English workers would think little of Indian artisans unless they were more diligent than some of these. But he blamed, no doubt justly, exhibition life as being rather demoralising to the best of workmen, and wondered if Englishmen would do any work at all under similar circumstances. He informed me that there are altogether 300 Indians, trustworthy men, mostly brought from Native States, working in the exhibition. They are under a superintendent, responsible for their health and comfort. Special arrangements for their food have been made. The people certainly look clean and well kept. In return for his civility, I told the manager that the beautiful little mosque in Lucknow Street, called a "Hindu Mosque" in the official guide, was very much misnamed, and that a Hindu no more cares for a mosque than does a vegetarian for a juicy beefsteak. Someone had evidently preceded me with the information, for there was a "connu" expression on the manager's face as he observed that in a later edition the mistake would be corrected. The mosque is stated to be intended for worship, but though I have carefully looked and listened on four visits, I have not yet espied a worshipper.

Near the Mosque, and more on a level with average aspirations, is a good tea house. It looks well from the outside, and is altogether admirable within. I have seldom seen Indian cotton hangings hung to better effect. The tea maidens are dressed in a curious Indian costume.

Leading from Lahore Square is a very fine gate, evidently a reproduction of one of the gates in the Fort at Delhi. Its massiveness, its distinctly oriental character, seem to be quite lost upon the thousands who stream in and out unheeding. Before one leaves the Indian city, the Indian jugglers with their many juggling feats, cobras, and mongooses, deserve a word. Next door to them is the Burmese puōy, in a building of a most superior kind, typical of the East, and worth more than a cursory glance. The entertainment to be had is unique. Several musicians are squatting on the stage, behind tom-toms of every size and shape, the said tom-toms being railed all round. Without any warning an ear-piercing, soul-maddening blast is produced on all the instruments at once, causing the audience to writhe on their seats, exciting, despite its utter lack of harmony. No doubt it is a Burmese war-whoop, kept up with variations, whilst some natives in queer costumes, with still more queer Mongol faces, begin wrestling vigorously. Gradually the awful blast dwindles down to the drone and whinny of what might pass for bagpipes, mild and musical by comparison with earlier feats.

The girls danced rather gracefully in a "Grecian bend" posture, danced with arms as well as legs, curiously waving handkerchiefs, which they changed later for fly-whisks. Then they too burst forth into a nasal song, which accorded well with the instrumental music, waving their hands the whole time. Before the performance began those who caused the tom-toms to shriek sat smoking calmly in the face of the Sahib. The ladies smoked too at a later stage, never seeming to think that any apology was necessary.

The great monstrosity of the Exhibition is a gigantic wheel, supposed to constitute a British compliment to American taste. It stands in a part of the grounds known as Elysia. It is as bad as, nay, it is far worse than the Eiffel tower. The impression it produced upon my mind was that it was as high as the welkin, but the faithful official guide rebukes the imaginative faculty, and informs us that it is three hundred feet. From the same source one gathers that the atrocity is a triumph of engineering skill. The axle is 7 feet in diameter and is supported on eight columns 150 feet high. Round the wheel are swung 40 cars, each meant to hold 30 to 40 persons. The wheel is so gigantic that the cars look like little boxes, for holding 40 flies (on the wheel). The amusement is that the wheel is made to revolve, and that every car rights itself during the revolution, so that you do not capsize. This must be amusing, and those who have tried it say that over and above retaining their perpendicular, passengers have a glorious view of London chimney pots—especially if, as happened a few days ago, the wheel happens to stick fast and detain its human cargo for a few hours.

S. A. CHALK & Co.,
26, SUFFOLK STREET, PALL MALL EAST, LONDON, S.W.
Telegraphic Address: "Dappled, London." "*A.B.C.*" *Code used.* Telephone No. 35347.

EAST INDIA and GENERAL AGENTS.

IMPORTERS OF
Produce, Fibres, Hides, Skins, Carpets, Embroideries, etc., etc., received and disposed of promptly.

INDENTS EXECUTED WITH BEST MANUFACTURERS. AGENCY WORK OF EVERY DESCRIPTION.

Our Mr. S. A. Chalk was an original partner with Mr. Wm. Digby, C.I.E., in the firm of Messrs. Wm. Hutchinson & Co., and conducted their Indian Commercial business for five years. He has now definitely retired from that Firm.

(Mr. Chalk will probably be in India during the coming Cold Season.)

JVARA-HARI. TRADE MARK.

Is what its name implies, **FEVER DESTROYER,**
and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. Wood, Captain 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value-payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. Narsinga Row.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Omum-Carpoor TRADE MARK

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office,
I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM CARPOOR" 8 ans., 1 Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free.
To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY.
43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C. and 27, SECOND LINE BEACH, MADRAS.

Printed by A. Bonner, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 9. (NEW SERIES.)] SEPTEMBER, 1895. [SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus"	257
"Tempora Mutantur"	262
The Financial Danger	264
India Closured	265
OUR LONDON LETTER	266
The Indian Parliamentary Committee	268
Eighth Provincial Conference: Presidential Address by D. E. Wacha	268
The Indian Import Duties	269
The Future of Chitral	270
THE GENERAL ELECTION, by Herbert W. Paul	273
INDIA—WHAT NEXT? by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.	274
CHITRAL IN 1895, by J. Dacosta	276
LORD ROSEBERY ON CHITRAL, by An Anglo-Indian	278
THE FEAR OF RUSSIAN INVASION, by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji	279
"EX UNO DISCE OMNES," by Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P.	281
SUPERFLUOUS OFFICES IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INDIA, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A.	281
The Royal Commission: Further Memorandum by the British Committee	284
REVIEW: The Vedanta Philosophy	287
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	288

Indiana.

Lord Salisbury's Government has, as we anticipated last month, decided to reverse the policy of its predecessors and to occupy Chitral with a permanent force. The reasons—if reasons they can be called—which are advanced in support of this decision are such as might have been expected from their authors. During the debate on the Address Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour were compelled to refer to the question, although it had been ignored in the Queen's Speech. Their contention was that, as a British force had entered Chitral, it could not retire with safety and dignity. The whole subject is discussed in another part of the present issue of INDIA. I may notice here that the excuses put forward by Lord Salisbury's Government amount to a strange contradiction of the proclamation issued by the Viceroy last March. The Tories are in no humour to explain and defend their policy. Sir W. Wedderburn, who had the strength of the Indian Parliamentary Committee at his back, gave notice of an amendment to the Address in these terms:

> "And we humbly pray that your Majesty will be pleased to direct your Majesty's Ministers to give effect to the instructions issued in June last to the Viceroy of India in Council to withdraw from Chitral at the earliest possible moment consistent with safety and dignity."

This amendment, which was reached shortly after midnight on August 19th, was actually "closured" before it was moved. Sir W. Wedderburn describes on another page the circumstances under which this unparalleled result was brought about. It is not difficult to understand the anxiety of Ministers to avoid discussion of their policy in Chitral. Many of their supporters, representing Lancashire constituencies, are pledged to the abolition of the Indian import duties. Nor is that all. Mr. Balfour and Lord George Hamilton—the former in his speech in the House of Commons on August 15th, and the latter in his reply to Sir W. Wedderburn's question on August 19th—have committed themselves to the astounding proposition that Chitral is within, and not without, the boundaries of India. The Government, however, is not to be let off. Sir Henry Fowler has given notice that he will call attention, on going into Committee on the Indian Budget, "to the decision recently arrived at by Her Majesty's Government as to the occupation of Chitral."

"We make" wrote the *Star* on August 21st, "no apology for returning to-day to the proceedings which occupied the House of Commons during the small hours of Tuesday morning. Sir William Wedderburn, the chairman of the Indian Parliamentary Committee and of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, had given notice of an amendment to the Address hostile to the 'forward' policy in Chitral. The amendment was undoubtedly regarded as specially dangerous by the Government, and attempts were made to persuade its author to postpone it until the Indian Budget comes up for discussion. Sir William Wedderburn, who is to be congratulated upon his tenacity, refused to give way, and those members of the House of Commons who are interested in Indian affairs knew perfectly well on Tuesday afternoon that the amendment would be proceeded with. Now mark the sequel. When the division had been taken upon Mr. Pickersgill's amendment, between midnight and one o'clock on Tuesday morning, Mr. Balfour appealed to Sir W. Wedderburn to postpone his amendment 'till a more convenient season'—more convenient, that is to say, for the Tory party. Among other considerations which were urged in favour of this course, Mr. Balfour referred to the fact that 'the late Secretary for India had left the House.' Why, we ask, had Mr. Fowler left the House? Why was he not in his place to support Sir W. Wedderburn and his colleagues of the Indian reform party? It is to be feared that Mr. Fowler, whose career at the India Office won the applause of Tories, does not appreciate, and is loth to encourage, the admirable work of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. If that is the case, so much the worse for Mr. Fowler. His absence from the House at so important a moment seems to have stimulated Mr. Balfour to take extreme measures. The result was that Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment was closured even before it had been moved. In other words, the first act of the new Government in regard to India has been to employ the brute force of its overwhelming majority in order to 'gag' the advocates of reform before they had begun to speak. Nothing quite so disgraceful in the dealings of the Tory party with India has happened since Lord George Hamilton, with one eye on the Treasury Bench and the other on Lancashire voters, delivered his notorious speech against the inclusion of cotton goods in the scope of Sir James Westland's import duties. Yet, we suppose, the Tory party will continue to swagger and boast and bluster about its imaginary zeal for scrupulous fairness towards India and the Empire generally."

"The net result of Tuesday's manœuvre, for which Mr. Balfour is chiefly to blame, though Mr. Fowler is not free from blame, is," the *Star* continued, "to postpone discussion of the Chitral question to the debate on the Indian Budget. Mr. Fowler, it is to be presumed, will then deliver a full-dress speech, while the members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, who have borne the burden and heat of the day, are carefully prevented from obtaining the credit they deserve. Needless to say, it is not praise which they desire. But if they had not been debarred from taking their rightful position in the House of Commons in regard to this important matter, their hands would have been strengthened and their Parliamentary influence greatly increased. That, no doubt, is what official members of both sides of the House plainly foresaw. Those who have left the India Office, those who are in it, and those who may in the fulness of time return to it, are not anxious that the representatives and the supporters of the Indian National Congress should be seen to take the lead and to take it with credit and success. The reflection is rather humiliating to Liberals. The pretext upon which the debate has been postponed is that important papers are awaiting presentation. That is beside the mark. Important papers are always awaiting presentation. Will anybody seriously deny that enough, and more than enough, is already known about past proceedings and future policy in Chitral to lend weight to Parliamentary criticism of the 'forward' policy? The pity of it is that the Liberal Government did not present papers on the subject. If Mr. Fowler had been a little less casual, and a little more obliging, to members of the Indian reform party in the House of Commons he might, partly by plain answers to plain questions and partly by the prompt publication of official documents, have rendered it almost impossible for Lord Salisbury's Government to adopt the policy of occupation. We do not forget that between last March, when the Chitral question arose, and July, when the General Election took place, we appealed time after time in these columns to Mr. Fowler the Liberal from Mr. Fowler the Secretary of State for India. What is truly amazing is that Lancashire, hating as it does the cotton duties that were rendered necessary by the financial embarrassments of India, does not raise its voice in vehement protest against the policy of military aggression, which is not only dangerous to our safety and discreditable to our honour, but is also primarily responsible for those financial embarrassments themselves."

The Earl of Onslow did not lose much time before delivering his first public speech as Under Secretary for India. On the last day of July he went down to the Royal Indian Engineering College at Cooper's Hill to distribute the annual prizes. In the course of some remarks which do not otherwise call for notice he gave a description of the qualities which, in his opinion, are required at the head of an administrative department like the India Office, and he made a noteworthy admission. Foreigners, he said, wonder that our military officers do not become Chief Secretaries for War, nor our admirals First Lords of the Admiralty. They ought not to wonder, for, according to the Earl of Onslow, "all that is expected from heads of great departments in Parliament is that they should have calm judgment and cool heads, and that they should be well acquainted with the temper of Parliament and the wishes of the people of this country." That is all, and, so far as India is concerned, the Indian Civil Service and the India Council do the rest. It would be, therefore, a mistake for the intelligent foreigner to imagine that the Secretary and the Under Secretary of State for India need to know something of the wants and wishes of the people of India. The confession is interesting and instructive. Cynical as it is, it will probably be more palatable to a certain section of Anglo-Indian officials than its author's frank, and perfectly accurate, admission in regard to the Famine Insurance Fund:

> "Those who went from that College would have important duties to perform in the development of the Indian Empire of the Queen, especially in the railway lines, in works of irrigation, and in providing against the occurrence of famine. It was a wise policy to set apart a fund for that purpose."

Henceforward, then, when overweening and spendthrift officials in India deny the existence of the Famine Insurance Fund and of any intention to create it, they may be referred to the Earl of Onslow.

By the death of Mr. Haridas Veharidas, India has suffered a great and lamentable loss. The people of India had no more unselfish, single-minded and enlightened champion. "We were shocked," says the *Indian Spectator* in an obituary notice, evidently written with intimate personal knowledge, "to hear of the sudden death of Mr. Haridas Veharidas. It is many years now since this writer had the pleasure of his acquaintance at Wadhwan; and he cherishes a vivid recollection of the interchange of ideas, carried on at night, far into the wee small hours. During these hours of intimacy Haridas impressed his visitor as a genuine friend of the people, a thoroughly honest and devoted worker, and a faithful servant. As such he remained to the end, the good qualities mellowing with age, and whatever was bad disappearing at the approach of higher knowledge. For Haridas was a student all his days. But for his modesty and self-denial, he might have risen higher. For years past he seems to have longed for retirement. And when, on leaving Junagarh a few months ago, he was pressed by this writer to give the benefit of his knowledge and experience to the public, he begged piteously to be let alone—'pray let me give my remaining years to the service of God.' Herein he showed himself a true Hindu. Little did our friend know how soon he was to be detached from life, for the best mode of offering homage to his Maker. But though he has gone to a rich reward, he has left India the poorer for his departure. To Gujrat the loss of Dewan Haridas is irreparable. He was a good man all round, and was more useful than many a great man, so called, in that he was always unconscious of his sterling qualities." Mr. Haridas Veharidas was a member of the Royal Commission on Opium and agreed with Mr. H. J. Wilson, M.P., in some of the matters in which he dissented from the report of the majority.

Indian and Anglo-Indian journals which have come to hand by recent mails bear remarkable testimony to the widespread regret that prevails in India at the defeat of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in Central Finsbury. I select for quotation a passage from the *Times of India*—the more noteworthy, perhaps, as it appears in a journal which regards Mr. Naoroji's opinions with little favour:—

> "We cannot regard without respect the widespread disappointment which Mr. Dadabhai's defeat has caused amongst his friends in this country. He was the exponent of opinions with which we were seldom in accord, for he looked at the British administration of India from a standpoint at which no one who dispassionately considered the requirements and the capabilities of the country could place himself. But we do not think that he ever seemed to his most resolute opponents as other than a straightforward, sincere, and disinterested champion of the views that he had adopted. His friends here have the satisfaction of knowing that his removal from Parliament by no means necessarily brings his public life in England to an end. He is no longer a member of the House of Commons, but he is still a member of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and he and his companion in misfortune, Mr. Caine, will have ample opportunity within the Commission of reiterating their well known views in favour of an economical administration of the straitened resources of India."

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji also remains, of course, one of the leading members of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress.

Side by side with expressions of regret at Mr. Naoroji's defeat one reads in these journals expressions of satisfaction and delight at Sir William Wedderburn's successful campaign in Banffshire. The following passage from the *Indian Spectator* may be quoted as typical:—

> "Amid the desert of disappointment caused by the General Election, Sir W. Wedderburn's return will be felt by his Indian friends to be the one oasis. Since news came of Mr. Dadabhai's defeat, there has been a daily straining of the eyes, we believe all over the country, to see what fate awaited this best trusted and most disinterested of India's friends. We may not agree with everything that Sir William Wedderburn says on our behalf; on questions of administrative details we often feel at variance with his views whilst admitting his superior practical experience. But for an earnest, whole-hearted, all-round reformer of abuse, political and social, there is none in the House, or outside of it, to compare with this sturdy old Radical. He belongs to that class of Anglo-Indians who say—'We owe everything to India, and are prepared to return to her whatever we can.' They call themselves, while in this country, the paid servants of the rayat, and on retirement they call themselves the rayat's pensioners. Thus has Sir William Wedderburn avowed his creed more than once. In his case the avowal has again and again been capped by acts of loyal devotion, such as we longed for on the part of India's own sons. Much of the present recrudescence of political activity on our behalf in England, which reminds one of the days of Sir Charles Forbes and his gallant colleagues, is due to the initiative and sustained effort of the Member for Banffshire."

On another page will be found the names of those members of the new House of Commons who now constitute the Indian Parliamentary Committee. They are 85 in number. A year ago the Indian Parliamentary Committee consisted of 152 members. Seven of these retired before the General Election, and the remaining 60 were either defeated at the polls or retired on the dissolution of Parliament. Sir William Wedderburn, M.P., as Chairman of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, has addressed the following letter to each of the former members of the Indian Parliamentary Committee :—

> "DEAR SIR,—By the desire of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, I write to thank you cordially for the services you have rendered to India as a Member of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, and to express their deep regret that you are no longer in Parliament. We trust that you will continue to take a friendly interest in Indian affairs, and sincerely hope that at an early date you may again occupy a seat in the House of Commons.

It is reasonable to assume that the Indian Parliamentary Committee will shortly be reinforced from the ranks of the new members.

The Summary of Events of the Administration of the Gondal State for the year 1894-5—an official report filling some fifty foolscap pages—is interesting and instructive reading. With this report the second decade of the administration of His Highness the Thakor Saheb begins. Happy the State that has no history! "Though unmarked by events of unusual interest, the year of report was," we are informed, "one of continued peace and prosperity." The area of Gondal is 1,024 square miles, and its population is estimated at 161,036 persons. The attention which is paid to education is highly satisfactory. The laying of the foundation stone of the Girasia school, for the sons of petty landholders, is but the most recent instance of the Prince's zeal in this direction. Many new scholarships have been founded by the Darbar during the year, including special scholarships for technical instruction. Mention may be made of the scholarships in connection with the railway workshops at Ghadechi, where some Gondal students are receiving practical instruction in mechanical industry. Scientific agriculture, also, claims the special care of His Highness, and last February the first of a series of agricultural shows was held at Gondal. The number of pupils at schools in the State rose during the year from 4,861 to 4,999, and the average attendance from 3,485 to 3,642. Mr. H. J. Wilson and his friends will be glad to learn that steps have been taken during the year to restrain the use of opium by the servants of the State. "It is ordered that those servants who are habitual opium-eaters should give up their habit within six months, or else their claims to promotion would be barred. It is further ruled that persons addicted to opium shall never be admitted into the State service." During the past year His Highness has made a donation of Rs. 20,000 to the Poona Fergusson College, and of Rs. 50,000 to the Oxford Indian Institute, "which," as the report states, "aims at spreading a correct knowledge of India in Great Britain from an ancient centre of learning in that country, and thereby bringing closer the bond of union between the United Kingdom and India."

Among other interesting facts, I notice that the export trade of Gondal showed an increase of Rs. 251,100 and the import trade an increase of Rs. 165,350 during the year, "attributable to the development of trade consequent on extended railway communication." The cash-assessment system, introduced last year in the Darbari *Khalsa* villages, has made a good start, and the cultivators are said to appreciate it. The number of offences reported in the State was 448 as compared with 573 in the preceding year. Steps have been taken to secure sanitary reforms, and a municipal recreation-ground is being prepared at Upleta. There are two hospitals, three dispensaries, and one travelling hospital in the State. No death has occurred in the prisons during the year. But perhaps the most valuable passage in the report is that which describes the mode in which Hindus and Muhammadans have agreed together to avoid religious disturbances :—

> "The annual fairs at Ganod and Osham hills, as well as the Holi and the Mohurrum festivals, have passed off quietly, except, it is to be regretted, a slight disturbance at Gondal, which took place on the night of July 12th last. Owing to the adoption of prompt precautionary measures by the Darbar, it was nipped in the bud, and though some mischief was caused by the Muhammadan rioters in several Hindu shops in the Bazaar, the *fracas* was immediately brought to an end, and its renewal was prevented by stricter police arrangements. A police investigation subsequently made resulted in the arrest of several culprits, and a special magistrate was appointed for their trial. An amicable settlement was however brought about amongst the contending parties after the trial had proceeded to a considerable length, through the instrumentality of the respectable members of each community, and at the earnest request of both the rival races who gave assurances for the future maintenance of peace, and who made certain arrangements amongst themselves for the tranquil celebration of their respective religious festivals, the Mohurrum and the Holi, the Darbar allowed the prosecutions to drop, making the Muhammadan accused pay compensation to those who had suffered loss. The special magistrate, Mr. Bhagwanlal, was rewarded by the Darbar for his good offices in bringing about the reconciliation and termination of their religious animosities by peaceful behaviour towards each other."

Here is an example of friendly intervention which might well be followed outside the limits of wisely administered native States like Gondal.

Supporters of the Indian National Congress will have heard with profound regret of the intended resignation of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P. The *Freeman's Journal* of August 21st published a letter addressed by him to Mr. Justin McCarthy announcing his retirement from the representation of West Waterford. Mr. Webb stated that he had arranged before the defeat of the late Government to pass the coming winter abroad, and a social event rendered it unlikely that he could after his return give as much attention as before to Parliamentary duties. He did not intend to stand at the last election, but was urged to do so, and was returned unopposed.

> "Recent events, however," he wrote, "oblige me now to retire. The party has not effectually resented the methods that thwarted and discouraged Mr. Sexton, it has not effectu-

> ally denounced the baseless attacks upon the character and patriotism of Mr. Blake and other members of the Committee, made at a moment and in a manner most calculated to injure national interests. It has in the recent election of the Committee practically condoned flagrant violations of the pledge. This is not the way to ensure lasting concord, and clear the character and sustain the prestige of the party. I am not inclined to submit that any in the party, however eminent, should be free from obligations to which others are bound. I have forwarded to the Speaker my application for the Chiltern Hundreds. I hope out of Parliament to give the cause such support as is within my power. I forward a subscription to the election fund, to be applied towards the expenses of any election that may take place in West Waterford."

It may not yet, we hope, be too late for Mr. Webb to reconsider his decision. Even if he should not, we may congratulate ourselves upon the fact that, while India will be deprived of his good offices in the House of Commons, he will still remain President of the Indian National Congress and a member of the British Committee.

The Presidential Address which Mr. D. E. Wacha delivered at the Bombay Provincial Conference, recently held at Belgaum, exhibits the qualities that were to be expected in that eloquent and untiring advocate of Indian reform. It is luminous, inspiriting and exhaustive—indeed, the reprint which is before me fills some twenty-eight pages of small type. It is impossible, within our limits of space, to do justice to a survey, at once so comprehensive and so minute, of current Indian problems. The second part of Mr. Wacha's Address is devoted to the affairs of the Bombay Presidency, and it opens with an expression of satisfaction at Lord Sandhurst's conduct as Governor. The enfranchisement of the Central Division, which has previously been noticed in these columns, was a creditable and encouraging act on the part of Lord Harris's successor. Lord Sandhurst has also given evidence of a sincere desire to establish that sense of harmony and close association between the Government and the people which is the best safeguard against religious disturbances. "Let us," says Mr. Wacha, "forget the past, and build our hopes of amity and brotherly feeling on Lord Sandhurst. His Excellency has begun well. He is already winning golden opinions on all sides. Let us look to him to remove the friction which still subsists on the music question." Mr. Wacha is specially concerned to impress upon the people of Bombay "the imperative necessity of a complete provincial organisation."

> "Conferences and Congresses will have to deal more in the future with such important questions as Land Revenue and Rural Indebtedness, Revised Assessments and Survey Settlements, Police and Justice, Education and Sanitation, Abkari and Forests. For effective representation on such matters, it is highly desirable to collect unimpeachable facts in the first instance—such facts as we may be able to stand by in case their accuracy is impugned."

The earlier portion of Mr. Wacha's speech deals with imperial problems. He attributes, and attributes rightly, the discontent that is increasingly manifest in India largely "to a deplorable want of knowledge at the governing centre of the inmost thoughts, feelings and wishes of our people." The notorious Police Amendment Act—which may be described for English readers as a Coercion Act squared and raised to the power of ten—furnished a stupendous example of the craving of the baser sort of bureaucrat for despotic power. The Act was rushed through by a majority of official votes in the teeth of unanswerable protests and in defiance of public opinion. The converse of this official zeal was shown by the refusal to amend the Civil Procedure Code, and by the hostility offered to the Cantonments Bill. "All the angry vituperation and the hypocritical denunciation" excited by the latter measure might, Mr. Wacha says, "have been avoided, had the military officials here refrained from setting at nought the authority of Parliament. . . . . The debate on the Cantonments Bill accentuates in a marked degree the necessity of Parliamentary interference in all cases where the supreme will of Parliament is frustrated or defied." As for the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act, Mr. Wacha declares that what is really wanted is a modification of the policy which now exacts rigid payments at fixed dates and, even under exceptional circumstances, allows no remissions. In another part of his Address, he dwells upon Mr. Hume's well-known Minute on "Agricultural Reform in India," and contends, with great force and unquestionable truth, that if the Government of India would but do its duty, the land might be made to yield more to the rayats than it does. "If," as Mr. Hume wrote, "our revenue from land is to undergo any very marked development, and to bear hereafter that proportion to the rest of our revenue that in times gone by it has always borne, it is to an increase in the produce of the land, to an improved system of agriculture in fact, that we must look."

A large part of Mr. Wacha's address is naturally devoted to financial criticism. It is, as he says, an anomaly that members of the enlarged Councils everywhere may discuss a Budget but cannot vote upon it. "There would be some reason in the refusal were it the case that the Government majority was in danger of being swept away. But when, as a matter of fact, the Councils are so constituted as to give the Government its majority, it is simply unreasonable to withhold the right of voting." The substance of Mr. Wacha's criticism of Sir James Westland's last Budget has already appeared in the columns of INDIA. He condemns the surplus as illusory, and proves, by way of reply to the newfangled official theory, that payments have been made to the Famine Insurance Fund in years of deficit as well as in years of surplus. Mr. Wacha calls attention to the dismal circumstance that from the days of Burke and Pitt to those of Peel and Bright, Fawcett and Bradlaugh, there has been one prolonged wail over the embarrassments of the Indian treasury. "It is," as John Bright said, "the policy that has been pursued there, which renders the revenue liable to this constantly recurring deficit." In particular Mr. Wacha blames

> "(i) That extravagant foreign agency which costs the country 17½ crores of rupees per annum in salaries and pensions, and drains away its life-blood;" and
>
> "(ii) That insatiable thirst for annexing territory after territory, and principality after principality, under the mischievous influence of a clique of puissant propagandists."

"It is indeed most astonishing," he says, "that our rulers are still unable to realise the fact that no Government can financially succeed which has a poverty-stricken people to govern on the one hand and which employs on the other a foreign agency the cost of which is absolutely beyond their ability to defray."

It is sometimes said by the ignorant or the perverse that non-official criticism of the Government of India is invariably negative. The rebuke does not apply to Mr. Wacha. He enumerates a series of practical measures which are necessary to place Indian finance on a sound and prosperous footing:

> "(i) A reduction of the costly civil and military expenditure;
> "(ii) More extensive employment of native agency;
> "(iii) A stable sinking fund for the reduction of the public debt;
> "(iv) A rigid policy of incurring all State liabilities in silver; and
> "(v) An improved method of husbandry with liberal State aid."

Perhaps the Lancashire members of Parliament who are pledged to abolish the Indian import duties will urge these proposals of reform upon the attention of Lord George Hamilton.

It is stated that Mr. K. S. Ranjitsinhji, who is a Liberal in politics, intends to seek election to the House of Commons. If this be so, and if he should be elected, there seems to be no reason why in these athletic days he should not speedily become Prime Minister. He is winning the hearts of the British public with a success which is not vouchsafed to the mere amateur of Blue Books. The following verses have been addressed by a Brighton poet "to Prince Ranjitsinhji, a Prince in every sense":—

"Hail there Illustrious Prince, all hail
Thy doughty deeds o'er hill and vale
Our gladsome theme shall be.
The Western county seemed dismay'd
When they the strong invasion made
On 'London' by the sea.
Undaunted sportsman, lov'd by all,
Like Nelson, there at duty's call
Now, as in bygone days,
Along with captain Murdoch's zeal
With Newham's nerve through woe and weal,
Our 'Prince of Cricket' plays.
You drive them here, you cut them there,
You seem to put them anywhere,
You, sir, deserve a place
Near, very near, the people's pride
Our chief, our general and our guide
Our matchless monarch, Grace.
Go search the land from south to north
Bring all your famous batsmen forth
Place them in grand array.
As sure as Britain rules the waves
I'll find a man to beat your braves,
The subject of my lay.
Our host of patrons prove your skill,
Your fearless heart and iron will
All tell a deathless tale.
Thrice blessed be that lucky day
You turned your footsteps Brighton way
Hail, Prince of Sport, all hail."

It has been said that the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton. Is the battle of Indian reform to be won after all on English cricket fields?

I take the following from the recently issued supplement to the thirteenth report of the Parliamentary Committee on Public Petitions. It will be seen that the demand for simultaneous examinations is by no means waning:—

Civil Service of India—For Open Competitive Examinations simultaneously in England and India.

		Brought forward, Petitions 41—Signatures	22,206
8975.	June 25.	There-undersigned Inhabitants of Hubli District, Dharwar, in public meeting assembled (*Sir W. Wedderburn*) ..	176
8976.	July 1.	There-undersigned Inhabitants of Kasba Digraj, in public meeting assembled (*Mr. Naoroji*)	131
8977.	—	— Madras (*Mr. Naoroji*)	436
8978.	July 2.	There-undersigned Inhabitants of Udamalpet and its suburbs (*Mr. Ainsworth*)	194
8979.	—	— Thindwanum and its suburbs (*Mr. Naoroji*)	160
8980.	—	— Trichinopoli and its suburbs (*Mr. Naoroji*)	100
8981.	—	— Bhimaceram and its suburbs (*Mr. Naoroji*)	97
8982.	—	— Bhimaceram and its suburbs (*Mr. Naoroji*)	98
8983.	July 3.	There-undersigned Inhabitants of Cocanada and its suburbs (*Mr. Naoroji*)	154
8984.	—	— Vundi and its suburbs (*Mr. Naoroji*)	177
		Total number of Petitions 51—Signatures	23,929

The Petitioners pray that Competitive Examinations for the Civil Service of India may be held simultaneously in England and India.

Fidus.

"TEMPORA MUTANTUR."

A remarkable article, under the heading "Indian "Affairs," appeared in the *Times* of August 1st. It was nothing else than a series of enthusiastic congratulations to the people of India upon the defeat and rout of the Liberal party at the general election and the return of the Tories to power. Two passages in particular in this curious production seem to call for notice. In one of them the writer states that "the weary task of pretending to rule India in the "interests of its peoples, subject to the constraining "necessity of conciliating Parliamentary groups, is "for the moment suspended." In the other passage he declares that the traditions of Lord Salisbury's Government "are the traditions of Imperial unity "and the declarations of its leaders form a pledge "that the unity of the whole shall also mean "justice to the parts." Now, a good deal must, no doubt, be excused to reckless partisans in the hour of overwhelming and unexpected victory. The *Times*, however, in its column upon "Indian Affairs," has hitherto professed to regard the interests of India from the standpoint not of the partisan but of the patriot. Is the *Times* about to adopt a new tone with the formation of a new Government? It is a familiar proposition, perhaps it is merely a rhetorical platitude, that the interests of India must not be regarded as a battle-ground for the contests of British parties. But if the tone of this remarkable article is deplorable, its remoteness from facts is more deplorable still. Which were the offending Parliamentary groups under the late Government, and how did they constrain conciliation at the expense of India? Is the accusation made against the Parliamentary opponents of the opium traffic? They secured, it is true, the appointment of a Royal Commission. But the cost of the Commission was paid by the British treasury, and the result of its enquiries was to strengthen the hands of the Government of India in respect of the opium revenue as they had never been strengthened before. Is the accusation made against the Indian Parliamentary Committee? Its members, championing the most popular demand in the India of to-day, secured a Resolution of the House of Commons in favour of simultaneous examinations. But the resolution was ignored by two Secretaries of State at the bidding of bureaucrats whom the *Times* delights to honour. The Indian Parliamentary Committee, thanks to unwearying persistence, also obtained the appointment of a Royal Commission to enquire into the expenditure of the Indian revenues. But it can hardly be this incident that provokes the indignation of the *Times*, for we read in the article to which we refer: "There are branches of Indian administration "which must from time to time form the subject of "Parliamentary enquiry. The financial relations of "India to the Home Government, and indeed the "general financial policy of India, are manifestly "questions of this sort."

Where, then, is the ground of complaint? We are driven to the conclusion that the *Times*, in its censure of Parliamentary groups for interfering with the interests of India, can only be referring to those members of the House of Commons who by vote and voice opposed the re-imposition of the cotton duties. Unfortunately, those members were, almost without exception, opponents of the late Government and supporters of the present Government with all its traditions of imperial unity and justice. We are almost ashamed to remind the *Times* that the motion which condemned the duties, and virtually advocated as an alternative the insolvency of India, was moved by Sir Henry James—now a peer and a member of the new Cabinet; that it was supported in the lobby by two to one of the Tories who were present; and that it was recommended to the House by Lord George Hamilton, the new Secretary of State for India, in a speech in which he declared that Lord Salisbury agreed with him. The imperial traditions of the Tory party did not prevent Tory candidates in Lancashire at the recent general election from appealing to audiences of weavers and cotton spinners on the strength of Lord George Hamilton's speech and his subsequent appointment. It is true that Lord George Hamilton in office, does not, as will be seen from a letter printed elsewhere, appear to be very anxious to carry out the policy which he advocated in opposition. But his dilemma hardly suggests that "the "weary task of pretending to rule India in the "interests of its peoples, subject to the constraining "necessity of conciliating Parliamentary groups, is "for the moment suspended." On the contrary Lord George Hamilton, we imagine, must feel, when he contemplates the Tory gains in Lancashire, that that weary task has just begun. The task will be made none the less weary by the decision of Lord George Hamilton and his colleagues, in defiance of the decision of their predecessors, to occupy Chitral with a permanent force. Whatever else the occupation of Chitral may or may not involve, it will not—to put it gently—involve any reduction in the military expenditure of the Government of India. Yet it was the financial embarrassments of the Government of India that rendered the re-imposition of the cotton duties necessary.

How far the new Government is likely to consider Indian wishes in dealing with the question may perhaps be inferred from the scandalous application of the closure to Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment on August 19th before it had begun to be discussed. Yet according to the *Times*, "for the first time "during many years there is a British Ministry "strong enough to govern India with a single eye "to the interests of that country." The Under Secretary of State for India seemed to suggest, in the speech which we comment upon elsewhere, that it was his business to govern India with a single eye to the interests of England. Perhaps he was imperfectly reported. But the past record of the Tory party does not encourage us to await its imperial policy with much confidence. Hitherto the imperial traditions of the Tory party, applied to India, have simply meant the prosecution of costly and futile war. The Tories were in power under Mr. Disraeli in 1868, and we had the Abyssinian War with its consequent burden upon the finances of India. They were in power in 1878, and we had the invasion of Afghanistan. They were the authors of the ruinous "forward" policy, and their decision in regard to Chitral indicates that they mean to be its finishers. They were in power in 1885, and were responsible for the invasion of Upper Burma. They were in power from 1886 to 1892, and this costly period of frontier expeditions and little wars has left its mark on the record of Indian deficit. But it is idle to enumerate particular instances. Lord Salisbury, who once designated Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji as "a black man," is not likely to bestow much consideration upon the wants and wishes of the Indian people. Let us, however, hope for the best. If our hopes should be vain, our disappointment ought to be shared by Sir W. W. Hunter. In his interesting speech at the National Liberal Club on February 18th last, that distinguished advocate of Indian progress said :—"I speak as one who sincerely and heartily desires to see accomplished the general programme of the Congress, and as one who believes that that accomplishment will be realised in this present century." Lord Salisbury has little more than four years in which to verify or to refute Sir W. W. Hunter's forecast.

THE FINANCIAL DANGER.

The September number of the *Investors' Review* contains a penetrating article on the financial question and its ultimate bearings, from the pen of the distinguished Editor, Mr. A. J. Wilson. Mr. Wilson reviews the "Notes" of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress with considerable fulness, and not only endorses but energetically enforces its contentions. On the immediate effects of the "Policy of Frontier Wars and Annexations" he says :—"As a matter of course these expeditions are always triumphant; but they cost more than the Indian people can afford, and in a defensive sense they are foolish beyond description, because

"(1) They bring us into more direct contact with hill tribes much better left to themselves.

"(2) They keep before the minds of the intelligent Natives of India our nightmare dread of Russia.

"(3) They entail on the Indian exchequer a constant increase in expenditure on 'punitive' expeditions, on roads and fortifications necessary to hold the conquered and annexed territory down, in subsidies to keep tribes, by the nature of things our bitterest foes, in nominal peaceful subjection; and (4) They immeasurably increase our vulnerability." If, on the other hand, we had pursued a policy of pacific internal development, leaving Russia or any other foe in Central or Eastern Asia the whole labour of getting at us, our position would have been impregnable.

What is "the net product of the vile policy of domination, extension, and petty conquest which became the guiding principle of the Government of India in a marked manner under the administration of Lord Lytton?" This :—"By the policy we have followed, we have been doing our very best to create for ourselves, should the big struggle come, an enormous, perhaps fatal, prestige of defeat, because we have made it certain that the Afghans, and all the mountaineers we have terrorised into sulky submission, will declare for our enemies the moment they get the chance. And we are establishing outposts which it will be impossible to sustain or relieve in time when the invader does come, so that the first news from the far outlying border of the Empire must be news of defection and defeat. Had we a loyal India behind us, initial disasters of this kind might be overcome, but India is not, cannot be, loyal. It is simply held down, and when the conflict breaks out, we shall have to enter it with an empty treasury, an army scattered to all the corners of the Empire, and disloyal and discontented populations on our frontiers and all around us."

Mr. Wilson exaggerates the sense of disloyalty, although his statements would be a very legitimate inference from the facts of the treatment of India. The frontier policy "is now, come war or peace, bringing the Imperial Raj of India into bankruptcy;" this, and not the fall of the rupee, which Mr. Wilson again insists has been as "a God-send to India, to her alien Government most of all."

> The end of this suicidal policy must be our destruction, the actual result of which is an exhausted Indian population, a crippled exchequer, and a continual wail of "we are bankrupt" by Indian officials, who, however, cloak the bold admission of the truth by clamouring for "bimetallism." They might just as sensibly howl for "bistoctuachism" in Europe as a means of increasing the consumption of Indian wheat, rice, and tea. But their outcry only means "bankruptcy is staring the Indian Government in the face. We cannot go on unless you let us cheat our creditors." And this in time of peace! Old John Company would have done better—could not possibly have done worse.

Mr. Wilson goes fully into the British Committee's figures, and Mr. Fowler's "Explanatory Memorandum" on the Indian Budget, which lays all the blame on the fall of the rupee, he characterizes as "a mere piece of official special pleading, unworthy of any intelligent Minister." The danger of the position he emphasises strongly:

> Why, a "tight money market" in London, such as the bankruptcy of a colony or a revolution in any great European State may easily produce, would force the Government of India into open insolvency at once, and then where would the "glorious empire" be? The fact that such a possibility exists is itself a damning indictment of the whole period of "Imperial rule" in that great, but sore distressed and hungry, dependency.

To show the poverty of India, Mr. Wilson analyses the official returns in the "Moral and Material Progress" Blue Book. We do not remember to have ever seen the true significance of the figures set forth in so clear and impressive a light. "With “all this assessing, and irrigating, and railway building, and settling, the Government of India is not able, one year with another, to get an average of 2 rupees an acre rent from the cultivated area of the Empire of India. Upon this thin base is the superstructure of our costly and wasteful administration reared.” Taking Mr. Fowler's memorandum as testimony to the “burden of taxation,” Mr. Wilson says: “the highest of these totals” for 1893-94 to 1895-96 “is less than 5s. per head, taking the rupee at its conventional valuation, and at its actual value less than 3s. per head. Could any fact more strikingly prove the utter poverty of the people? To pay this tribute to us one year with another multitudes of the inhabitants of India live in semi-starvation; in hard years many perish altogether.” If the railways are prosperous, “it is a prosperity by which we have profited far more than the people of India. . . . . For all the profits of Indian railways are enjoyed by Europeans—all but a very small fraction.” And “one of the most significant of all the indications of the feebleness of our hold upon India, and the smallness of the result to the people of our ‘developing’ fever, is to be seen in the steady imports of bullion into India.” Mr. Wilson concludes his powerful article in these wisely suggestive words: “The mind cannot contemplate a future so full of risks and sinister probabilities without sadness. So much good has been meant to India, so much good done by its English masters, that we could hope still for the future were their ideals even now changed. Were real economy to give place to the present system of pillage; were the interests of the people studied first, and our own imperialist follies and vanities put out of sight for ever; were the abuses of the India Office in London, and its hideous robberies abated or swept away; were the cost of the army brought down to the limits necessary to keep our present territory in order, and all conquests henceforth eschewed; were the internal administration opened more fully to natives so that the swarms of Europeans now eating up the lands as officials or pensioners might be diminished; were the burdens of interest involved by the railways gradually diminished, and in all directions economy and retrenchment enforced, our sway over India might even now be consolidated and made enduring. But the refusal to take this path and the continuance of our present habits and policy mean that our power in India is digging its own grave. And all the glory of our mighty Empire hangs by our prosperous continuance there.”

INDIA CLOSURED.

When it was known that Her Majesty's Government had, in the small hours of Tuesday morning, August 20th, applied the “gag” to Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment relating to Chitral, our interviewer hastened to wait upon him, in order to learn the Parliamentary reasons for so extraordinary a proceeding.

“Yes,” said Sir W. Wedderburn in reply, “it does seem a very extraordinary proceeding, and the more I think of it the more extraordinary it appears. We all know the objects for which the closure was instituted. The primary object was to deal with obstruction, to put a stop to talk which was not *boná fide* discussion but only a means of preventing work being done. In the hands of an overwhelming majority the weapon is a dangerous one, but it was understood that it was only to be used in self-defence, in order that the purposes of a great legislative assembly should not be defeated. In extreme cases it might be used where a subject is discussed with persistent irrelevancy and tediousness. But it is clearly a new departure to use this weapon in order to exclude discussion altogether, simply on the ground that it is inconvenient for the Government that the discussion should take place. The precedent is a most dangerous one, and strikes at the usefulness of the House of Commons as a free assembly.”

“Had you any reason to anticipate the ‘gag’?”

“None, whatever. In the course of the evening (Monday, August 19th) the present Secretary of State for India (Lord G. Hamilton) spoke to me on the subject, courteously suggesting that it would be better to have the debate at the time of the Indian Budget, when the fresh information promised by the Government would be before the House. But I explained to him that those who acted with me considered an Amendment on the Address to offer the best opportunity of bringing forward a matter of so much importance; that a large number of members would have left London before the Indian Budget came up for debate; and that there would then be many other competing questions for discussion. Nothing was then said to show that I should have any difficulty in bringing on my amendment that night if that was my wish. The twelve o'clock rule had been suspended, so afterwards, when the hour was getting late, I made privately an appeal to Mr. Balfour to allow the Chitral Amendment to stand over to the next day. The object of this appeal was, of course, to get a good report in the newspapers, for, as you are aware, proceedings after twelve get only very brief mention. Mr. Balfour, in reply, said that he regretted he could not agree to this proposal, as it had been decided that the debate should end that night. No hint of a possible closure was then given, and I do not think that at this time it was even contemplated by the right hon. gentleman.”

“How then did it come about?”

“Some of our side moved the adjournment of the debate. The motion was well meant, but it had the effect of bringing the closure down upon us. To closure a motion for adjournment, which may be treated as a procrastinating motion, does not revolt the moral sense. But the effect was very serious, for the closure having been once carried, its effect is to telescope the whole debate. In other words, if the successful mover of the closure makes the claim, the original motion may at once be put, sweeping away all remaining amendments. In the present case, Mr. Balfour claimed that this effect should follow. Consequently, the debate was suddenly brought to a close without my being able to put in even a word of protest or appeal, for in the case of the closure no discussion of any sort is allowed. I will do Mr. Balfour the justice to say that I do not think he would deliberately have put the closure upon me personally had I begun my speech before the motion for adjournment had been moved. But as the Tory majority had closured that motion and thus once tasted blood, the temptation to finish off the whole thing at once, to get to bed, and at the same time to be rid of a troublesome attack, proved too great, and I fell a victim, partly to a misuse of the "gag", but also to circumstances, and to my own want of experience in the methods of parliamentary warfare. Had the forms of the House allowed me, as in the case of a criminal offender, to show cause why sentence should not be passed against me, I think that there were some considerations that I might have put forward in arrest of judgment. In the first place independent members very seldom indeed get an opportunity of bringing any matter before the House, so that it is cruel to deprive them of their opportunity when by chance they get one. And it is specially cruel in the case of poor India who has no electors to resent the disregard of her interests. Could I have appealed to Mr. Balfour, I should have asked for only half an hour to state my case, and I feel sure that the House would have been willing to grant me at least that amount of hearing, knowing that I had some special knowledge of the subject from long service in the Indian political department. Could I have appealed to the Speaker, I might have pointed out to him that my amendment had been put down on the notice paper before Mr. Pickersgill's regarding the unemployed, but that in order to suit the convenience of debate, his amendment was taken first. This was no fault of mine, and I should not have been made to suffer."

"And how about the Front Opposition Bench? Did they not come to your rescue? What did they do?"

"They simply threw me to the wolves. For reasons best known to himself, Mr. Fowler marched out of the House when my amendment was to be called on, so that Mr. Balfour was able to refer to his absence as a reason against allowing the debate to proceed. How his conduct appeared to unprejudiced minds is set forth in the *Star* of Wednesday last."

"But I daresay you received sympathy from a good many quarters?"

"Yes, on our side of the House a feeling of indignation was pretty general, and even on the other side I think some sympathy was felt. They believed I was only trying to do what I thought was my duty towards the people of India. I think a good many must have also seen that a dangerous precedent was being created for the misuse of the closure. It is a contradiction in terms to close a man's mouth before he has opened it, and that is what happened in my case. During these proceedings I felt most keenly the absence from the House of my old fellow-worker Mr. Naoroji, the best and most unselfish of India's friends."

OUR LONDON LETTER.

Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts—commonly called, the Indian Budget—is, at the time of writing (August 26th), set down as the first order of the day for Wednesday, August 28th. The present progress of business in the House of Commons hardly warrants the expectation that the Indian Budget will be reached on that day, unless exceptional measures are taken to curtail discussion. But it is not easy to exaggerate the power of a Government which commands a majority of 152.

The notice-paper already contains the terms of three motions which are to be moved on going into Committee on the Indian Budget. Sir H. H. Fowler has given notice that he will call attention to the decision recently arrived at by Her Majesty's Government as to the occupation of Chitral, and will move a resolution. Mr. Maclean has given notice that he will move to insert, in the terms of the motion before the House, the words that "this House views with apprehension the continual increase in the burdens of Indian taxpayers, caused by the annexation of large areas of unproductive territory on the land frontier of British India." Mr. Philip Stanhope has given notice that he will call attention to the question of Import Duties in India and move a resolution.

It will be noticed that discussion upon these motions will be preliminary to the debate on the Indian Budget, not a part of it. It is commonly assumed that it is impossible to move an amendment to the motion before the House when the Indian Budget is being considered in Committee. That motion amounts simply to a statement that the accounts before the House are the East India Revenue Accounts. An ingenious member of the House of Commons has, however, suggested that one might move an amendment to the effect that these accounts are inaccurate and misleading.

The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure is not more expeditious than Royal Commissions usually are. Having been interrupted by the General Election, it will meet on August 27th to discuss the question whether it shall hold its next meeting in November or in the spring of next year, after the re-assembling of Parliament. It is generally anticipated that the later date will be selected.

We have referred, in previous numbers, to the treatment of British Indian subjects in the South African Republic. They complain, and with only too abundant reason, that they are deprived of the rights which other British subjects exercise, and to which all subjects of Great Britain are entitled by international law. Petitions and memorials setting forth their grievances were laid before the late Government, but Lord Ripon was prevented from receiving a deputation on the subject by the sudden defeat which he and his colleagues sustained in the House of Commons. The matter has, consequently, been brought to the notice of Mr. Chamberlain, the present Secretary for the Colonies, and he has consented to receive, on August 29th, a deputation of Indians now resident in London. It is understood that Mr.

Dadabhai Naoroji will introduce the deputation, and that Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee will be one of the speakers. The matter has throughout received the active attention of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has promised to preside at the next Annual Dinner of the London Indian Society, which will be held at the Holborn Restaurant on September 4th.

Colonel Kelly, writing privately to a friend in England about the troops who accompanied him from Gilghit, says:—"Ever ready, cheerful, undergoing hardships without a murmur, staunch under fire and physical difficulties, they are to me the most wonderful examples of soldiers, and I am extremely proud of them, especially the regiment I have the honour to command, who have behaved admirably throughout this march. The Kashmir troops, too, have done equally well, and the way they fought at Reshun under Edwards and Fowler and in Chitral itself is evidence of what they are made of."

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of the Lieutenant-Colonel Adelbert Cecil Talbot, C.I.E., as Knight Commander of the Order of the Indian Empire. Colonel Talbot has acted as interpreter during the visit of the Shahzada, and has accompanied him on all his official visits. He is an officer in the Foreign Department of the Government of India. He obtained his commission in the Royal Artillery in 1867, joined the Staff Corps and was sent on special duty with the Afghan Commissioner in the Seistan Arbitration in 1872-3. After a succession of important political appointments in Rajputana and elsewhere, he became in 1888 Officiating Resident in Turkish Arabia, and in 1891 Resident on the Persian Gulf.

The Queen has been pleased to confer the honour of knighthood upon Mr. Thomas Martin, who came to England with the Shahzada as the agent of the Amír, and has since kept the Amír regularly informed of the Prince's movements in England.

Mr. George Russell has completed his collection of of Matthew Arnold's Letters, and it is expected that the book will be published by Messers. Macmillan early in the autumn.

Mr. A. E. Fletcher, the late editor of the *Daily Chronicle*, has received resolutions and letters from the Liberal and Radical Associations of Greenock putting on record their pleasure at having had the Liberal and Radical caused "championed in such an able, eloquent, and energetic manner," testifying that his failure to capture the seat from Sir Thomas Sutherland cannot in any way be attributed to anything that he did or left undone, expressing the hope that he may soon find a seat in Parliament, and intimating that the Liberal Association had determined to relieve him of the whole of his election expenses, amounting to £593 17s. 2d.

Lancashire (wrote the *Westminster Gazette* on August 21st) has returned men to the House of Commons pledged to vote for the repeal of the Indian Cotton Duties. But hitherto they have made no sign, they have held no meeting, they have allowed the Government to count upon them as devoted and loyal adherents. This is a situation that cannot last, and so an intimation is made that when the Indian Budget comes on they will "call attention" to the matter. This Platonic method of discussion will prove to be eminently satisfactory to the Government, which will promise to take steps to do without the duties in some good time coming, and all will be well. Lancashire electors were terribly in earnest in July, but in August they are tepid. A big majority has this advantage, it seems, that it enables a Ministry to wink at Lancashire, and Lancashire thinks it understands. Does it really?

The visit of the Shahzada has been prolonged beyond the period which was originally anticipated. In reply to somewhat sensational rumours which obtained currency a few days ago, Reuter's Agency states that, on the occasion of his reception by the Queen at Windsor, the Shahzada communicated a request from the Amír that the Government of Afghanistan should be officially represented by a diplomatist in London. To this request an unfavourable reply was afterwards received by Nasrulla Khan. The Amír, it is said, requested his son not to cross the Arabian Sea until the second week in September, on account of the monsoon.

Mr. Justice Mathew has been elected to succeed Lord Justice Lindley as chairman of the Council of Legal Education. He has for some considerable time taken a leading part in the proceedings of the Council, and (in the opinion of the *Law Journal*) many of the changes that have recently been made in the educational system of the Inns of Court are said to have been due in no small degree to his initiative and energy. His first act as chairman of the council was to sign the prospectus of lectures and classes to be held during Michaelmas Term. The term will be noteworthy because the lectures will be opened to non-members of the Inns upon payment of moderate fees and to members of the Bar without any charge.

A Brighton reporter has interviewed Mr. K. S. Ranjitsinhji as to his connexion with the Sussex eleven. The famous cricketer has rooms at Eastbourne, and thus fulfilled the residential qualification. He had a great desire to play in county matches on the Hove ground. "I like the team (he said), I like the people, and I think Brighton is a delightful place to make one's headquarters through the cricket season." "And the Sussex County Ground?" "That was one of the reasons why I wanted to belong to the Sussex eleven. For every one—players, press and public—I think it is one of the very best grounds in England, and therefore, in the world." "And do you propose to play for Sussex next year?" was the next query. "Of course I can't tell you how that may be. But I should like very much to play for Sussex next year; and if nothing unforeseen occurs, I hope they will let me do so." "Have you anything to remark, as an impartial—I will not say disinterested—observer, as as to the prospects of Sussex for next season?" "All that I need say about that now," was the emphatic reply, "is that we want to find a bowler. When we have that it will take some one to beat us."

INDIAN PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE.

The Indian Parliamentary Committee at present consists of the following members of the House of Commons. We refer in "Indiana" to the losses of the General Election.

Ambrose, Dr. Robert.
Arch, Joseph.
Baker, Sir John.
Bayley, Thomas.
Buchanan, T. R.
Burns, John.
Channing, F. A.
Clark, Dr. G. B.
Clough, Walter A.
Crombie, J. W.
Condon, Thos. J.
Curran, T. B.
Commins, Dr.
Dalziel, J. H.
Dilke, Sir C. W., Bart.
Donelan, Captain.
Ellis, John E.
Esmonde, Sir T. G., Bart.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert.
Field, Wm.
Flynn, J. C.
Fenwick, Chas.
Gilhooly, Jas.
Holden, Angus.
Hunter, Dr. W. A.
Harrington, T.
Hogan, J. F.
Jones, David B.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kitson, Sir Jas., Bart.
Kennedy, P. J.
Kilbride, Denis.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid, Bt.
Leng, Sir John.
Lewis, J. Herbert.
Logan, J. W.
Lough, Thos.
Luttrell, H. C. E.
Lyell, Sir Leonard.
Leese, Sir Joseph F.
McLaren, Chas. B.
Montagu, Sir Samuel, Bt.
MacNeill, J. G. Swift.
McCartan, Michael.
McCarthy, Justin.
M'Hugh, E.
Mains, John.
Mandeville, F.
Norton, Captain Cecil.
Nussey, T. W.
Owen, Thos.
O'Brien, J. F. X.
O'Connor, Jas.
Pease, H. Fell.
Pease, Sir Joseph, Bart.
Pickersgill, E. H.
Priestley, Briggs.
Provand, A. D.
Pinkerton, John.
Price, R. J.
Randell, David.
Roberts, J. Bryn.
Roberts, J. Herbert.
Roche, John.
Schwann, C. E.
Smith, Samuel.
Spicer, Albert.
Stuart, James.
Sheehan, J. D.
Sheehy, David.
Shaw, W. Rawson.
Shaw, C. E.
Thomas, Alfred.
Tuite, Jas.
Walton, J. Lawson.
Wedderburn, Sir W., Bart.
Whittaker, T. P.
Wilson, Chas. H.
Wilson, John (Govan).
Wilson, John (Durham).
Wilson, J. Havelock.
Webb, Alfred.
Weir, J. Galloway.
Wilson, H. J.
Young, Samuel.

EIGHT PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS BY MR. D. E. WACHA.

We take the following passages from the important Address recently delivered at Belgaum by Mr. D. E. Wacha as President of the Eight Provincial Conference:—

It is indeed a remarkable circumstance in connexion with the finances of India that from the days of Burke and Pitt to those of Peel and Bright, Fawcett and Bradlaugh, there has been one prolonged wail over the deficits and embarrassments of the Indian treasury. I will not tire your patience by quoting the testimony of every one of these English statesmen. But I crave your indulgence to let me quote a passage from one of the most memorable speeches which Bright delivered on India in the House of Commons. Criticising the finances of the country on 24th June 1858, that righteous Puritan and statesman observed:—"If there were another charge to be made against the past Government of India it would be with regard to the state of the finances. Where was there a bad Government whose finances were in good order? Where was there really a good Government whose finances were in bad order? Is there a better test in the long run of the condition of a people and the merits of a Government than the state of the finances? And yet not only in our time, but going back through all the pages of Mill or any other history of India, we find the normal condition of the finances of India has been that of deficit and bankruptcy. I maintain that if that be so, the Government is a bad Government. It has cost more to govern India than the Government has been able to extract from the population of India. The Government has not been scrupulous as to the amount of the taxes or the mode in which they have been levied." A truer charge against Indian finances could not have been brought home. But is it not the case, gentlemen, that though, since the words I have just quoted were uttered, the Government of this country has been directly administered by the Crown, we have witnessed no improvement in the condition of Indian finances? Is it not the case that it is as unsound at its foundation to-day as it was a hundred years ago? Is it not the case that its ordinary condition even at this moment is one of deficit and bankruptcy, despite all the optimism of Mr. Fowler? Is not the Government growing costlier year by year? Is it not imposing new burdens from time to time on a poverty-stricken people which are altogether beyond their means and capacity? Is it not the case that its ethics are as bad as ever in the application of taxes? Has a single individual in this vast peninsula been satisfied with the morality of the application of the special tax originally imposed in 1876-77 for the purposes of insurance against famine. Has it not been diverted more than once from its purpose proper? And what is the tale as to deficits? You have only to refer, gentlemen, to the published official accounts, dating from 1834-35 to be convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt of their chronic condition. During the sixty years since that date you have had 34 years of deficits amounting to 83·50 crores of Rupees and 26 years of surpluses amounting to 42·85 crores, with the result that there was up to the end of 1893-94 a net deficit of 40·65 crores, giving an annual average of 67 lakhs. During the same period the public debt has risen from 26 crores to 210 crores of which 42 were increased during the last ten years only.

FICTITIOUS SURPLUSES.

But it should be remembered, gentlemen, that the deficits of 40½ crores in sixty years do not tell the true tale. There have been years in which deficits have been converted into surpluses by a process which all sound canons of public finance absolutely condemn—by a process which no private merchant or banker having a reputation to lose would ever venture to adopt. Some of the surpluses, it was proved to demonstration before the East India Finance Committee, (1871-74) were arrived at by crediting to current revenue items of receipts which should have been properly credited to capital or debt account. The fact of fictitious surpluses having been manufactured in the past was vividly brought to the notice of the House of Commons in that remarkably able and incisive speech, bristling with figures, which the late lamented Mr. Fawcett delivered on 6th August, 1872. Referring to the accounts of the eleven years preceding, that impartial economist and expert observed: "When there has been a surplus, this surplus has been obtained by devoting capital to income, and is therefore purely fictitious. . . . . Let me entreat the House to remember that a simple statement of income and expenditure during the last few years will utterly fail to give any true idea of our financial position. Our difficulties have been so pressing, such desparate efforts have been made to lessen the deficit and create a surplus, that, like embarrassed traders, the Government of India have been using up their capital, they have been appropriating to income what ought to have been devoted to reduce debt, they have been using funds which ought to have been kept to meet interior charges; in fact, in a single sentence, they have been performing that financial operation which is known as discounting the future." Mr. Fawcett then gave six striking instances in support of his charge against the Government of exhibiting fictitious surpluses or minimising the deadweight of appalling deficits. We should, gentlemen, be forgetting the past financial history of India, if we were so charitable as to assume that the days of such fictitious accounts are gone. I, for one, am unwilling to believe that the Government of to-day is a whit better in the management of its finances than that of the past fifty or even hundred years. On the contrary, my study of Indian finances tells me that in this matter history only repeats itself. I have just pointed out to you how far illusory is the budget of the present year, concealing as it does from the public view the true deficit of 6 crores. And I make bold to say that were a Committee of independent experts sitting to-day to scrutinise the accounts for the past ten years, which have proved so disastrous to Indian finance, they would be obliged to reveal a tale similar to what Mr. Fawcett related to the House 23 years ago.

THE CAUSE OF DEFICITS.

To what then may we attribute the cause of the chronic deficit? I shall tell it in a word—to *Policy*. It is superfluous for me to inform you what political economists and practical politicians and statesmen have over and over again remarked, that the expenditure of a country depends on the policy pursued by its Government in the conduct of its administration. This is a trite State maxim. Speaking about India, Bright observed in the same speech to which I have already referred: "It is the policy that has been pursued there which renders the revenue liable to this constantly recurring deficit." Economists tell us that a sound policy is the first condition of productive labour and of the saving that creates capital. It is therefore highly essential for a State which is not an absolute despotism to carefully examine what influence its policy has on the economic progress of the people. It has to be ruefully acknowledged that it is the mischievous policy of the Indian Government which is at the root of the present financial distress. It is a policy directly opposed to that which stimulates productive labour, accumulates wealth, and enables the people to better endure the burdens of growing taxation.

MILITARY AGGRESSION AND FOREIGN AGENCY.

If you were to ask me what are the potent factors of that policy which are at present dominating our finances and plunging them into a condition of chronic embarrassment, and even distress, I would unhesitatingly assert that they are firstly, that extravagant foreign agency which costs the country 17½ crores of Rupees[1] per annum in salaries and pensions and drains away its life blood; and, secondly, that insatiable thirst for annexing territory after territory and principality after principality under the mischievous influence of a clique of puissant propagandists who have raised what is appropriately described as "bastard Imperialism" into a cult or fetish at the seat of the central authority since the evil days of the Penjdeh scare. It is this part of the Imperial policy which has added 7 crores per annum to your military expenditure. It is this which has cost during the decade well nigh 15 crores in those strategic railways, etc., and fruitless punitive expeditions hither and thither beyond the natural lines of the country's defence—expeditions ostensibly taken for the purpose of chastising refractory wild tribes on the borders, but in reality for pushing the boundaries of the empire in the mad pursuit of meeting the Cossack half way in the inhospitable and impenetrable regions of the Hindu Kush. Think, gentlemen, of all this waste of public expenditure. Think of the immense good these crores which have been squandered on needless additional troops and expeditions, on secret and public subsidies, on strategic railways and so forth, might have done to the country by their employment in those productive channels which would have contributed to the increase of national wealth.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Mr. Richmond Ritchie of the India Office, wrote to the Association of Lancashire Cotton Spinners, under date August 8th:—

Gentlemen,—I am directed by Lord George Hamilton to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2nd inst., asking him, on behalf of the Indian Import Duties Committee, to receive a deputation representing the cotton employers and cotton operatives of Lancashire, on the subject of the Indian Cotton Duties. In reply I am directed to say that Lord George Hamilton would be glad to receive the deputation if there is any fresh information which the committee wish to convey to him. But the memorial submitted with Mr. Garnett's letter of the 10th July, which his Lordship is now most closely considering, dealt exhaustively with the whole question, and Lord George Hamilton suggests that it would be better for him to deal with the memorial first without having extraneous matter added to it. Later on, if his lordship finds he requires new facts or information, he will communicate with your committee.

---

[1] *Vide* "Parliamentary Return (East India Salaries)" 17th May, 1892.

In the course of an article on the opening of Parliament, the *Daily News* wrote on August 12th :—"It will be difficult for Ministers to avoid all reference to foreign affairs in the Queen's Speech. But even if they overcome the difficulty, the terms of the Speech do not limit the range of the topics which may be brought forward on the Address. . . . . There are the Indian cotton duties which have been denounced by the Secretary of State for India, with the approval of the Prime Minister. Lord George Hamilton has found it convenient to put off a deputation from Lancashire, which sought an interview with him to protest against the continuance of the duties. But the House of Commons cannot be treated so cavalierly as a deputation, and Lord George ought to welcome an opportunity of declaring that the mere extortion of office has not altered either his principles or his practice."

THE FUTURE OF CHITRAL.

The Simla correspondent of the *Times* telegraphed as follows, under date August 2nd :

The Government has decided to abandon all the country to the west of the Panjkora River as soon as this is considered practicable from a military point of view. Bajaur will then remain under tribal government, while the Khan of Dir will administer the Baraul Valley.

This will enable the field force to be reduced by two British and one native battalions, and the reserve brigade to be broken up. There will remain for holding the direct route from Peshawar to Chitral through Dir some 11,000 troops, which will be ample for all purposes pending the final settlement of the future of Chitral.

The retirement from Jandol will be effected with extreme precautions, as any sudden retirement might tempt the fanatical tribesmen to rise. The Panjkora route is an easy one, and passable for camels.

The following telegram was despatched from Simla, through Reuter's Agency, on August 10th :

The proposals of the Indian Government for holding Chitral have now been sanctioned. The British garrison will consist of two native regiments with two mountain guns and two Maxims, and these will hold the country from Chitral to Kala-Darosh, where the headquarters will be established. From Kala-Darosh to Dir the country will be under Chitral levies, the Khan of Dir providing them as far as Chakdarra. The brigade on the Malakand Pass, with a regiment at Chakdarra, will complete the line of communication. The Panjkora route will be opened for postal supply and relief purposes. The troops will remain for the present at Malakand and at the crossing of the Swat river. The decision of the Government is warmly approved here.

The following Reuter's telegrams have been received from Simla :—

August 12th :—Sir George Robertson will go shortly to Chitral in connection with the settlement of the country. The 2nd Battalion of the Third Goorkhas and the Twenty-fifth Punjab Infantry, with guns, will form the Chitral garrison. No British troops will remain across the frontier. When the withdrawal is complete, the reserve brigade at Hoti-Marden will return immediately.

August 15th :—The Jandwala Valley has been evacuated by the British without a shot having been fired. Umra Khan's relations have again settled on the various estates in it belonging to the family. The Jirgas of the Narwagai, Salarzai, and Utman Khels have been interviewed, and it is believed that the further withdrawal of British troops without any trouble arising is assured.

August 13th :—Six native regiments will remain across the frontier in connection with the Chitral settlement, and it is proposed that Madras regiments should take their place in Northern India. The annual cost of the retention of Chitral is estimated at about 25 lakhs of rupees. General Waterfield will command the Malakand brigade and Colonel Hutchinson the Chitral garrison.

The followers of Umra Khan who were sent from Peshawar have reached Mundah.

The *Daily News* of August 6th contained the following letter to the Editor, signed "C. E. B." :—

Sir,—The Report upon the expenditure on frontier wars since the year 1887 has shown that these little military excursions have cost the Indian Government about £9,000,000. This is, of course, exclusive of the Afghan War, which alone cost about £20,000,000.

There has thus been a total expenditure shown during the past sixteen years not falling far short of £30,000,000, in round numbers, upon various forms of frontier enterprises, from a war involving the employment of about 70,000 men under arms to a petty raid of a couple of thousand men, all of which have to every appearance been absolutely barren of result. Now, do we honestly believe that these operations have all been engaged in from a *boná fide* belief in their absolute necessity for the preservation of the Empire, which in the existing state of the Indian finances could have been their sole possible justification? Have we not, on the contrary, serious grounds for believing that the occasion of the greater portion of them may have been a craving for excitement and notoriety and rewards, the outgrowth of which may be seen in the ridiculous exaggeration of the terms in which every petty advantage of our troops is described over a barbarous and contemptible opponent, as compared with any European rival whom we might be called upon to meet?

The "bogey" of a threatened invasion of India from the north-west, which has for so many years been industriously made use of, not, it is to be feared, from entirely patriotic motives, has gradually become stripped of almost all its terrors, as successive travellers have enlightened us more and more regarding the real character of the regions intervening between the frontier of India and that of the Russian possessions in Central Asia. We can thus no longer seriously believe in the possibility of an army of European soldiers, which could not be counted by less than scores and fifties of thousands, marching to the invasion of India across a region which has been described by Captain Younghusband as "a sea of mountains and inaccessible peaks, covered for the most part throughout the year with perpetual snow," across a fractional portion of which, it should be noted, we have, though backed up by all the resources of India, been able, only with the greatest difficulty, and by straining every effort, to transport an army of 15,000 men.

If we do not believe this, then why, in the name of fortune, do we hesitate one day to abandon such a remote position as that of Chitral, which has been proved to be of absolutely no strategical value, and the only result of our occupation of which has been to involve us in all sorts of expense and difficulties, culminating in an expedition which threatens very shortly in its expenditure to far exceed any other that has been undertaken since the Afghan War? Two crores of rupees, or about £1,500,000, is the lowest estimate made. Even admitting, however, the feasibility of a Russian invasion under certain circumstances, it would still be our plainest duty to abandon all such remote out-posts as being far more certain to embarrass us in the present from the complications in which they involve us, than likely to be of service to us in a remote and, as most people think, an impossible contingency.

History and our own experiences have alike plainly shown us that the only policy to be pursued with advantage in our treatment of the savage and intractable tribes whtch inhabit these regions is to leave them severely alone, for against such fanatical and irreconcilable foes either force or bribes have proved equally unavailable. The wildness and sterility of their country, as much as the indomitable hostility of its inhabitants, has made any solid impression by force of arms impossible of attainment; while their duplicity and cupidity is such that a bribe or subsidy has no influence over them, except in so far as it offers a prospect of another, and this influence disappears simultaneously with the appearance upon the scene of some other candidate for the national favour ready to outbid the original briber. There is no occasion for us to either threaten or court them, for by the former policy we should only ensure their hostility, while were such an improbable contingency to occur as that we should be in actual need of their co-operation, this would be more readily and certainly secured by offering them subsidies at the time.

The *Daily News* of August 16th, commenting on the preceding day's debate in the House of Lords, wrote:—Lord Rosebery's protest against the annexation of Chitral was equally animated and convincing. Her Majesty's Ministers can, of course, appeal to the unanimous opinion of the Indian Government. Lord Elgin is, unfortunately, in the hands of the forward school, who are dragging India down into the abyss of bankruptcy. The annexation of Chitral is one of those stupendous blunders which local zealots may sometimes commit, but against which it is the special duty of the Secretary of State to guard. Lord Rosebery is the last man who will be accused of indifference to Imperial interests. He is more disposed than most Liberals to extend the limits of the Queen's dominions. But he pointed out yesterday with unanswerable force that by piercing the mountainous boundaries of Chitral a valuable safeguard agaiast invasion was destroyed, and that the retention of Chitral was a distinct breach of faith. The Chitralis were told that the sole object of the Government of India was to put an end in the present to unlawful acts in Chitral territory, and to prevent them in the future, and that as soon as that object had been attained, the force would be withdrawn. Sir Henry Fowler's decision was as wise as it was honest, and Lord George Hamilton's departure from it is in every respect deplorable. It is an act of military folly, of financial recklessness, and of unscrupulous, high-handed wrong.

The *Times* (August 16th) wrote: Upon the question of Chitral there was naturally less agreement [than upon the question of Ammenia]. The late Government had decided, on such information as they possessed, in favour of evacuation, but they were turned out before they had time to make an official announcement in Parliament on the subject. The present Government have resolved not to recede from the region which has been occupied at so great a loss. Lord Salisbury has promised papers on the subject, and until these are forthcoming he deprecated prolonged discussion of it as a bad economy of time. From his own remarks, however, and those of the leader of the House of Commons a good answer may be made to the case for retirement. In the first place we now know on the authority of the Secretary of State for India that the Indian Government are absolutely unanimous in support of the policy of remaining in Chitral. We know, too, that the Home Government has had the advantage of forming their judgment upon information which was not accessible to Sir Henry Fowler. We know that the retention is likely to be less costly than was supposed. All the eminent soldiers, Mr. Balfour stated, who have visited the district, and, as he intimated, almost all who considered the question at all, believe that the strategic reasons for retaining our hold on Chitral are very strong. They do not share Lord Rosebery's apprehension that if we make roads towards the passes the invaders may march down them. That would be an argument for not making any roads at all. There are, however, political as well as strategic objections advanced against the policy of the Government. It is said that our presence in Chitral will hurt the susceptibilities of Russia. We have no desire to hurt anybody's susceptibilities, but Chitral is by treaty within our sphere, and we cannot recognise the right of any power to prevent us from acting within that sphere as we think best. Both Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour insisted, as we have repeatedly insisted in these columns, on the mischievous moral consequences of a retreat. A retreat, said the Premier, would be "most unwise as a question of moral strategy." It would encourage the tribes to the south of the Hindu Kush to waver in their allegiance, and we cannot permit any hesitation on their part. To us, and to us alone, they must look as their suzerains. Lord Rosebery expressed some anxiety lest an undue concentration of our attention on the north-west frontier might expose us to perils in another quarter. The late Premier's concern about the recent success of French policy on the Mekong is most natural. But it seems to be exaggerated. He forgets that France, unlike Russia, has no overland communications with the borders of India. She must keep up her communications by sea, and, when she can do that in our despite, we shall have lost not India only, but our position in the world.

Writing on August 26th the *Daily News* said:—The Indian Budget will, according to present arrangements, be considered in the House of Commons next Wednesday, and a very important debate may be expected on the occupation of Chitral. Sir Henry Fowler has given notice that he will move a Resolution on the subject, and as he is directly responsible for the decision of the late Government that Chitral should be evacuated, his speech will be an authoritative statement of Liberal policy. Lord George Hamilton has a good deal to explain. In the first place he has to account for the complete and immediate reversal of his predecessor's policy. Sir Henry Fowler, having consulted the Indian Council had determined before leaving office with the full assent of his colleagues, that after the successful relief of the British garrison under Dr. Robertson, the forces of the Crown should be withdrawn from Chitral. Nothing could be clearer or more explicit than the language of Lord Rosebery in the House of Lords during the debate on the Address. Lord Rosebery gave four reasons for withdrawing from Chitral. The first was the danger of removing a formidable barrier against the invasion of India by the construction of roads through the mountains. The second was the risk of upsetting the agreement with Russia with regard to the Pamirs. The third was the breach of faith which retention would involve. The fourth was the great increase of expenditure which would be required. In our opinion the leading and guiding consideration in this matter must be the plighted faith of the paramount Power. When the expedition was despatched under Sir Robert Low to the rescue of the garrison, the Viceroy issued a proclamation to the tribes through whose territory Sir Robert was to march. The purpose of this manifesto was to deter the natives from resisting Sir Robert Low's advance. "The sole object of the Government," said Lord Elgin, "is to put an end to the present and prevent any future unlawful aggression on Chitral territory, and as soon as this object has been attained, the force will be withdrawn." It is quite impossible to mistake the meaning of these words. In using them Lord Elgin of course spoke as the direct representative of the Queen and of the nation. He pledged the honour of this country in the clearest and the most solemn manner. How after giving this assurance Lord Elgin can have persuaded himself, or allowed himself to be persuaded, that Chitral could be retained without fatally lowering the reputation of England we are at a loss to conceive. He was doubtless under the influence of the Council, and especially of Sir George White, the commander-in-chief. But the Viceroy is intended in such matters to have a will and an opinion of his own. If he is to be merely a pliant instrument in the hands of professional experts he might as well stay at home. Unfortunately, Lord Elgin has surrendered to the "forward school" as it is called, whose progress is through continual war to eventual bankruptcy. But even for those great Imperial ends we cannot afford to break our promises. Lord Rosebery in the House of Lords challenged the Government to produce the elaborate minute of Sir Donald Stewart, the military member of the Indian Council. We repeat that challenge. There is no man whose opinion is entitled to more weight on such a question than Sir Donald's. Sir Donald Stewart has occupied his present position for nine years. He was commander-in-chief in India for four years. He received the thanks of Parliament for his conduct in the last Afghan campaign, and especially for his march to Kandahar. When Mr. Gladstone's Government, including the Duke of Devonshire and Mr. Chamberlain, evacuated Kandahar in 1880 the forward school raised a most unholy din. They declared that England was disgraced, and they made play upon every occasion with their favourite word "prestige." They sent a deputation to the Duke of Devonshire, then Lord Hartington and Secretary of State for India. When Lord Hartington came to reply, he went straight to the point. "What right," he asked, "have we to be there?" He defended the policy of the Government in the House of Commons with conspicuous ability and vigour. Has he not been justified by subsequent history? Is there an intelligent man acquainted with India who regrets the abandonment of Kandahar? We do not believe that there is one. . . . . Sir Donald Stewart is not the only man whose views upon Chitral ought to be put before the public. They are also entitled to know what the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjaub thinks. There is not an abler man in India than Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick, and if his opinions are suppressed we shall know the reason why. If the Government are going to take their stand upon alleged grounds of military necessity, they will have to produce the highest available authority in their support. Lord Roberts it may be assumed will support Sir George White. But what of Sir Redvers Buller? The Adjutant-General of the forces must know something about the principles of frontier defence. Sir Redvers Buller, however, is not the head of the army. The Government have just appointed a new Commander-in-Chief to succeed the Duke of Cambridge next November. Let Lord George Hamilton get up in the House of Commons and say, if he can, that Lord Wolseley is in favour, as a military measure, of retaining Chitral. That the general weight of Anglo-Indian opinion, not usually hostile to annexation, is against this foolish bit of grab there can be no doubt. Sir Neville Chamberlain and Sir Lepel Griffin have expressed their hostility in very plain words.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of India cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of India. 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to India (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with India, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of India can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., Trinity Street, Cambridge; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

India presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1895.

THE GENERAL ELECTION.

By Herbert W. Paul.

Although I was myself a defeated candidate at the last general election, I do not propose to say anything in this article about the special causes of the result in South Edinburgh. They were, I believe, mainly, if not entirely, local, and as such would not interest the readers of India. I desire, however, to thank Mr. K. Chaudhuri, of the Calcutta Bar, for the excellent speech he made on my behalf, and for the trouble he took in canvassing voters for the Liberal party. The failure of Mr. Dadabhai Noaroji to retain his seat for Central Finsbury is a loss to India so infinitely greater than my rejection that it would be alike absurd and indecent to speak further of myself. Mr. Caine has also gone, and with him a friendly vigilance for native rights which was never relaxed.

The special aspect of the elections which most concerns the Indian people is, of course, the serious thinning of the Liberal ranks in Lancashire. Mr. Balfour, writing with a gravity which Gibbon might have envied, attributes this transference of Lancashire votes to enthusiasm for the maintenance of existing relations between Great Britain and Ireland. A man who could really believe that would believe anything. Bimetallism, which the first Lord of the Treasury cultivates with academic passion, had something to do with it. But the chief cause was undoubtedly the Indian cotton duties. I pointed out in these columns last spring that in voting, as most of them did vote, against the mischievous and unpatriotic motion of Sir Henry James, the Lancashire Liberals took a courageous as well as an honourable course. They have been punished by their constituents for putting the solvency of the Indian Empire above the supposed interests of the Lancashire cotton trade. Mr. Holland, Mr. Roby, Mr. Snape, and Sir Henry Roscoe are among those who voted with Mr. Fowler, and who have no place in the new Parliament. Mr. Schwann, now the only Liberal member for Manchester, is an exception on one side, and Mr. Hopwood is an exception on the other. But, as a general rule, those Lancashire members who went against the duties have been returned, and those who went in their favour have not. Yet Sir Henry Fowler proved to the satisfaction of the whole House of Commons that the duties were absolutely essential, and were not in their nature protective. They are paid, I need hardly say, by the consumers of English cotton in India, and not by the manufacturers in Lancashire. They were accompanied, under positive compulsion from the Secretary of State, by a countervailing excise, which Sir Henry Fowler promised to make a perfect equivalent of the duty on the imported goods.

That, however, I regret to say, is not all, nor the end of the story. The only man who spoke in that debate from the front Opposition Bench against the duties was Lord George Hamilton. He declared that he had the express authority of the present Prime Minister for doing so, and Lord Salisbury has since made him Secretary of State for India. One must either be too simple or too saintly for this world to doubt that Lord Salisbury's object was to catch the Lancashire vote. This proves that the leaders of the party which boasts of putting imperial unity and national policy above all local and sectional matters have deliberately sacrificed Indian finance to the Tories and Protectionists of Lancashire. Among the Lancashire members who went into the anti-Indian lobby were Sir Matthew Ridley, Mr. Hanbury, Lord Stanley, and Mr. Legh. Sir Matthew Ridley is now Home Secretary, Mr. Hanbury is Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Lord Stanley is a Lord of the Treasury, and Mr. Legh moved the Address. Mr. T. W. Russell, who was in the same lobby, is Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board. It is a bad business, and must have evil results.

For the rest, I do not know that I can add much to what has been already said about the large Tory majority, and how it was composed. It is out of all ratio to what on a system of proportional representation it would be. For my part, I am not disposed to quarrel with such a result. In aristocratic constitutions weak governments are better than strong ones. In democratic constitutions strong governments are better than weak ones. Only I should like reciprocity. In 1886, as in 1895, the majority reckoned in seats was more than double the majority reckoned in votes. In 1892, on the same principle, we Liberals ought to have had a majority of about a hundred. We had a majority of forty. These facts have made a considerable impression upon many men who used to detest the idea of proportional representation. But no doubt the present Government will leave things as they are. In England, as distinguished from Scotland and Wales, the cry that Liberals wanted to rob the poor man of his beer lost them many thousands of votes. The quarrels of Irish Nationalists disheartened Home Rulers, the Liberal chiefs did not pull together, and the neglect of registration, with one man one vote, for Welsh Disestablishment, which could not pass, was a fatal blunder.

HERBERT PAUL.

INDIA—WHAT NEXT.

By PROFESSOR A. F. MURISON, LL.D.

It is a pious opinion that India ought not to form a battle-ground between English political parties, but the change of Government inevitably suggests troublesome doubts as to how far the excellent principle is likely to find embodiment in practice. The essential spirit of Toryism is not to be restrained from working out its natural effects, except when it is curbed by the personal fair-mindedness of an Indian Secretary of State like Sir Stafford Northcote, who did not give up to party what was meant for the empire. Lord George Hamilton, despite his experience of the Under Secretaryship, cannot, on any principles of reason, be recognised as a man of the mental calibre requisite for wielding effectively the great powers of the Secretary for India. With the best intentions in the world, he cannot be expected to hold the ground against the social influences that environ and support him, and against the weight of technical authority and party expediency that will be brought to bear upon his judgment. From the very accidents of fortune, his experience necessarily determines his sympathies towards the aristocrat and the official; and there is nothing in his public career to show that the condition and aspirations of the masses of the people have touched his imagination with any quickening and fruitful realisation. On the contrary, he has but recently shown a grievously reckless contempt for them, which, we must hope, the responsibilities of office will modify. In any case, he has to reckon with the viceregal experience of Lord Lansdowne, and with the special knowledge and brisk self-assertion of Mr. Curzon—both men of aristocratic temper and associations like himself, and of more energy of character. Above all, there are the pressing exigencies of the party. Setting aside questions that need not call forth any particular vehemence of the Conservative temper, and that are therefore capable of treatment in an equable spirit, there are questions of far-reaching importance to India on which the party are deeply pledged in a sense gravely adverse to the interests of the Indian people. Already we know that the Liberal policy of withdrawal from Chitral is to be reversed. Will Lord George Hamilton dare to disappoint the expectations which won Lancashire for the Tory party? Can we reasonably anticipate, after all that has come and gone in recent weeks, that the cotton duties will be maintained? May we not even be plunged in the last disasters of an unsuitable monetary standard? If the new Secretary for India were the strongest man of the century, his tenure of power under such conditions must be regarded with the gravest apprehension.

The reversal of the Liberal policy of retirement from Chitral is, as matters stand, invested with a fundamental importance. For it compromises the good faith of the Indian Government; it confirms a perversely dangerous, costly, and unnecessary policy; and it involves seriously the financial stability and the internal development of the country. "The sole object of the Indian Government," ran the Viceroy's Proclamation, "is to put an end to the present and to prevent any future unlawful aggression upon Chitral territory, and as soon as this object has been attained the force will be withdrawn." When Lord Rosebery recalled these terms of the Viceroy's Proclamation in the House of Lords, he was greeted with ministerial cries that appeared to indicate the recognition of some obvious way of reconciling with them the Government's determination to keep a grip on Chitral; but it may be very strongly doubted whether the tribes of the hills or the natives of the plains will be able to command an equal muster of political finesse. The summary of arguments for withdrawal, presented by the late Prime Minister, contain further elements of great importance. Lord Roberts is now content with ferries over the two rivers, and a road to be guarded by local levies. Lord Rosebery justly pointed out—what has been insisted on by an all but unanimous consensus of technical authority—that the mountain barrier, which is practically an absolute defence against a large invading army, is substantially broken down to facilitate the passage of such a force, by the construction and maintenance of an easy road. Besides, the agreement with Russia on the subject of the Pamir boundary ensures the absence of hostile parties on this side, spying out the land or inciting to disaffection and disturbance; while, on the other hand, it is no mere fancy that, such agreement being in force, the Russian Government may consider the retention of a military post at Chitral as something in the nature of a menace, requiring on their side a counteracting measure of a similar character. It is obvious enough, in any case, that the attitude assumed by the Goverment tends to assist Russian diplomacy whenever it may become politic for the Russian Government to cause us embarrassment and expense on the Frontier. Then there is the vexatious element of expenditure, with all that it means in the present condition of the Indian exchequer. Apart from the cost of the expedition, which can be paid somehow and be done with, there is the continuing drain for keeping open the communications—a drain that has no visible or imaginable end. Lord Salisbury says the Government have no intention of increasing the strength of the Indian military force. It follows that he must necessarily weaken the military force in many places throughout India: a fact that indicates either that the force has hitherto been much too large, or else that the Government has suddenly satisfied itself that the previous Tory feeling did injustice to the peaceable and loyal temper of the people. Lord Salisbury also professes that the Government has no intention of increasing the military expenditure of India. If the statement be not casuistical, it is not easily intelligible. How can 11,000 men be maintained on the Chitral road without an increase of expenditure? We shall no doubt learn something of the nature of the truth in the Blue Books of the future, when, of course, as usual in such cases, the truth will come too late. Mr. Balfour, like Lord Salisbury, is concerned for the blow to our prestige, "if, having once gone to this territory, we were to abandon it"—even though the Viceroy proclaimed at the outset that this was the very course that his Government was determined to take! Why was that Proclamation issued, if not to conciliate the hill tribes? Now that they find the Government violating its promised word, and their independence encroached upon, how can they depend upon English assurances? and how can we be assured that their friendliness is not mere temporising lip-service? The irritation must be intense, and after Lord Salisbury's miraculous majority has been scattered to the political winds, it will remain to his successors a *damnosa hereditas* of distrust, vexation, and expenditure. Mr. Balfour, in the debate of the 15th August, promised papers on the subject "before the end of next week, or in any case before the Indian Budget." We write without the advantage of studying the papers, but we do not suppose there can be anything in their contents to modify our intense dislike of the policy they are alleged to support and justify.

Even without the burden of the Chitral Expedition, and with the assistance of the cotton duties, Sir James Westland would have had a tough job to make ends meet. Will the Government redeem its pledges to Lancashire and repeal the cotton duties? There is no objection in principle, if the Indian revenue can afford it, to repealing the whole of the import duties. But to repeal the import duties on cotton alone, and leave the rest in full operation, would be invidious in the extreme, especially after the irritation already set up. "Upon what principle," asked Mr. Asquith, at Hull (Jan. 22), "can we justify—we who are responsible for the Government of India—an exemption from that tariff of a a particular class of goods which happen to be manufactured here in a particular county of England—we who are here in trust for the people of India? Our rule rests, it is true, upon force; but it is a rule which is safeguarded, which is dignified, by the confident belief of the Indian people that the power we obtained by force will be used in their own interests and not to serve our own ends, and when any sacrifice is demanded, both policy and honour demand that we shall make the sacrifice." Undoubtedly. But Lancashire ignores both policy and honour, and refuses to make the sacrifice; and the Government has got to pay for the votes of Lancashire. When Mr. A. J. Balfour was addressing his constituents in East Manchester on Jan. 17, he dealt with this question expressly, but carefully reserved the possibilities of better information; "everything I say to you," he insisted, "must be subject to such modifications as more perfect knowledge of the circumstances may bring home to my mind." The only hole he could pretend to pick in Mr. Fowler's arrangements was a ridiculously small one dependent upon a purely imaginative contingency. Lancashire exports cotton goods above twenties to India; Mr. Fowler's excise tax, equivalent to the import duty, was put on Indian cotton goods, to prevent protection. But then, "the result of putting a particular tax upon cotton goods of this class—cotton goods above twenties—will be," Mr. Balfour was told, "to decrease the consumption in that class of cotton goods and to increase the consumption in the class of cotton goods below twenties which we do not export and on which there will be no taxation at all." Then he proceeded:

> "From all I know of the general principles of taxation, that is a natural and a probable, I had almost said an inevitable result, and if it be an inevitable result, then it remains the fact that the English Government have assented to a scheme of taxation in India which does amount, in substance and in truth, to a protective prohibition against Lancashire goods, and I say that that is a very serious responsibility for any Government, Indian or English, to take upon themselves."

Out of more slender materials, surely, was never political gossamer more laboriously spun. At the same time the impression was conveyed to the willing cotton spinner and cotton worker that some practical relief might be forthcoming were Mr. Balfour and his friends in power. It will not do, however, simply to take a stroke of the pen through the cotton duties; some substantial means must be found to supply the hard cash to the treasury. And this necessity brought Mr. Balfour to the preposterous currency juggle:

> "What impresses me most strongly in all this is, that if we had a reasonable monetary system as between England and India there need have been no deficit to begin with, there need have been no cotton duties, no taxation of Lancashire goods, no protection, direct or indirect, in favour of the Indian manufacturer, because—recollect that, though I am taxing your patience, this is the very root of the question—the difficulties between England and India are Exchange difficulties, and Exchange difficulties only, and if India at this moment is to make up a deficit, she has to make it up simply and solely because she has to make payments in gold in England and has only depreciated silver wherewith to make them. If there were a par of Exchange between gold and silver, there not only would be no deficit in India at this moment, but there would never have been a deficit in all these years, and the surplus in the hands of the Indian Minister of Finance would have been sufficient, and more than sufficient for all the requirements of the country. . . . . If, therefore, you could cure the evil from which the difficulty of Exchange arises, if you could adopt any system of currency—as I think you could—by which this difficulty will be avoided . . . . the evil would be cured at the root, and you would not have to occupy your time in any quack remedies or expedients."

"Quack remedies" is audaciously good. Bimetallism, then, is the Chaplin-Balfour salve for India's broken limbs—a hopelessly discredited nostrum. The city of London will join with Lancashire in pressing for a prompt application of the quack remedy. Perorating to the Bimetallic League, at the Mansion House, on April 3, "I say to myself," declared Mr. Balfour, "that the reproach which is now upon us cannot surely be of long duration, and that the time is not far distant when men of all parties, of all occupations, and of all interests will combine to say that it is our business to do our best, at all events, to bring to an end a reproach to our common civilisation, and to introduce into our international transactions some medium of exchange less open to criticism, less destructive of settled industry, less embarrassing to the merchant, than the absurd system under which it is our present misfortune to live." Now Mr. Balfour is in power, and the city and Lancashire will no doubt call upon him to "do his best, at all events, to bring to an end a reproach to our common civilisation"—and so forth. It seems utterly impossible to believe that Lord Salisbury will permit even the attempt to realise such gaseous suggestions and aspirations. Mr. Balfour's balloon was, one would think, firmly tethered, and sent up only for diversion. We shall see.

The less contentious questions—the questions least likely to evoke party spirit—may, probably enough, fare about as well as they would have done under a Liberal *régime*. There is no need to review the more outstanding of them now. But a word may be said on the pressing subject of Simultaneous Examinations. Against this demand of the Indian people there is no substantial argument whatever. Lord George Hamilton has already shown how little he cares for the opinion of India, but it is just possible that he may be open to wiser suggestions from higher authorities. Is it beyond hope that the strong views of Sir Stafford Northcote may still awaken some echo in the high places of the Government? Writing to Sir John Lawrence in 1867, Sir Stafford said this: "Whether any use could be made of the Gilchrist foundation to enable young men to come over here and compete, or whether a certain number of appointments should be given by competitive examination in India itself, the successful candidates being selected at a somewhat earlier age than is the case with those whom we select here, and being sent over at the expense of the Government to complete their education, is, I think, a point well worthy of your consideration." "It seems a mockery," he wrote to Lord Napier, "to tell them to come and compete in Westminster if they like." Lord George Hamilton would do well to meditate on these suggestions of Sir Stafford Northcote. The question of the Home Charges, too, ought to make way, considering the force of opinion on the Conservative side as to their excessive and unjust incidence upon India; but, of course, the difficulty lies mainly in the general financial trouble. Nor is it unreasonable to expect that some reform may be applied to the unhappy combination of judicial and executive functions, the evils of which have been admitted by Lord Cross as well as by Lord Kimberley; although this, too, falls within the fringe of the all-embracing difficulty of finance. The Indian Parliamentary party, though much shaken in the *mêlée* of the general election, may still hope, with due perseverance and address, to see their work prospering in their hands, somewhat slowly, perhaps, yet steadily and surely.

A. F. Murison.

It has been determined to establish a Women's University Settlement in Bombay, where it is hoped that successful missionary work of an educational kind can be accomplished among the Parsi women. The Committee is formed from members of Newnham and Girton Colleges, the London and Edinburgh Medical Schools for Women, Queen Margaret College, Glasgow, and Alexandra College, Dublin.

CHITRAL IN 1895.

By J. Dacosta.

On January 1st, 1895, the Mehtar, or ruler of Chitral, whom the British Government had supported with money and promises of protection, was put to death by his tribesmen, and the new ruler signified to the British agent posted at Chitral for maintaining the right of suzerainty which our Government, in recent years, claimed to exercise over that State, that he must forthwith leave the Chitral territory, and that, if the British Government desired to hold diplomatic communications with the State, they might send a Muhammadan agent.

A supreme law in Muhammadan States prohibits the residence of *kâfars* (infidels) in their territory, unless they be guests or servants, and the Afghan tribes, among whom that law is religiously observed, are bound to co-operate with each other in its execution, and to suspend their intertribal feuds meanwhile. The law in question was forcibly brought to our knowledge by the tragical fate of three British envoys who were put to death with every circumstance of insult and defiance because they had, in violation of that law, been installed on Muhammadan territory by force of arms—namely, Sir W. Hay Macnaghten and Sir Alexander Burns in 1840, and Sir Louis Cavignari in 1879. It was therefore an unpardonable error, if not a criminal act, on the part of the Government of India, to have placed a British Envoy in a defenceless situation in Chitral, where his life was wantonly imperilled, and the insults offered to him were insults to the nation whom he was charged to represent.

After the fall of our *protégé*, the late Mehtar of Chitral, communications with India were interrupted. But we learned that our agent and his escort were closely besieged in the fort. A force of 15,000 troops was then organised at Peshawar under the command of General Sir R. Low, and ordered to hasten to the rescue of the British agent at Chitral, marching by the shortest route, namely through the Swat territory and Dir, and some 500 troops, which were stationed at Gilghit and Mastuj, received orders to advance with a similar mission. Neither of those forces, however, reached Chitral in time to release our agent and his escort, whose situation by the middle of April had become extremely precarious. Fortunately, the Government had purchased the aid of several native chiefs—among them, of the ex-ruler of Dir, who had been deposed some years before by a rival chieftain, Umra Khan, the ruler of the neighbouring State of Bajaur. As Umra Khan now assisted the Chitralis to liberate their country from British influence, the impending conflict between him and the force under Sir R. Low held out to the Khan of Dir the prospect of regaining his principality. He therefore readily listened to our proposals, and bartered his services for our money grants and promises of future benefits. Accordingly a portion of his army of 5,000 men, subsidised by us, advanced on Chitral with the speed with which natives alone can move in those difficult and inclement regions. At their approach, on April 19th, the tribesmen who were attacking the British agent and troops shut up in the fort, raised the siege and dispersed, thus releasing the small British garrison which had defended itself heroically, but was much reduced by privations, overwork and casualties, our agent himself being among the wounded. On the next day, April 20th, the shattered remnant of the troops from Gilghit and Mastuj, led by Colonel Kelly, arrived within twenty miles of Chitral, after an eventful march of hard fighting, cruel exposure, privations and excessive work in the snow. As regards Sir R. Low's army, the picked men under General Gatacre, who had marched with the utmost speed possible, entered Chitral nearly a month after our envoy and his escort were released. Thus, without the timely succour of the Khan of Dir, who compelled the Chitralis to raise the siege of the fort, and who aided General Low's army with supplies, transport and information, our agent, his escort and the survivors of our troops from Gilghit and Mastuj, might have been starved or overwhelmed by the foe, ere the Chitral Relief Force from Peshawar could have reached them.

The right of suzerainty—which the British Government claim to exercise over Chitral—rests upon no substantial ground whatever. The Indian Viceroy, in his statement on the subject last spring, spoke of some former Mehtar of Chitral having offered suzerainty to a former Máháraja at Kashmir and, urged that the suzerainty thus offered devolved on the British Government as the paramount power in India. No evidence of the offer was produced, while the probability of a Muhammadan ruler offering suzerainty to an unbelieving Hindu, a *Káfar*, is weak in the extreme. At all events, the offer, if made, had no binding power—under the Muhammadan law—over the successors or subjects of the ruler who may have made it; and as to the argument of our deriving that suzerainty as the paramount power in India, it should be remembered that our relations with Kashmir are not those of a Supreme power dealing with a subject State, but the relations of two allied powers regulated by treaty—the treaty concluded by us in 1846 and confirmed by the Queen's proclamation of November, 1858, when the Government of India was assumed by the Crown.

The rights we claim over Chitral are, therefore, purely fictitious. Our motive for attempting to bring that State and other portions of the Afghan borderland under British influence and dominion, is obviously to facilitate the conquest of Afghanistan in pursuance of the scheme of 1875—a scheme which was inaugurated by our contracting for the lease of Quetta, by the construction of the Sind-Pishin railway and by the disastrous Afghan war of 1878-80. The plea that the scheme was designed to defend India against a Russian invasion was created solely for the purpose of spending Indian revenue in the enterprise, and of eluding thereby the duty which the British Constitution imposes on the Government of applying to Parliament for war supplies—a condition intended to protect the nation from being involved in a war the expediency of which had not been discussed in Parliament and justified to the representatives of the nation.

That the conquest of Afghanistan and its occupation by British garrisons would add to the safety of India is a bare assertion, the utter fallacy of which has been exposed by our highest authorities; and by none more conclusively than by Lord Roberts in his despatch of May, 1880. The scheme of 1875 was not a scheme of defence. It was a disguised policy of conquest which has involved us for nineteen years in continual warfare with the Afghans, has cost us an appalling amount in blood and treasure, has brought upon us lamentable disasters and humiliations, and has, ere this, proved itself utterly impracticable, seeing that all our efforts to execute it have failed to advance our frontier a single day's march from the line on which it previously stood. Spots beyond that line have been temporarily occupied by us, but our troops during such occupation were the object of constant attacks from local tribesmen whom they entirely failed to subjugate.

Our failure, as predicted by the authorities who condemned the scheme of 1875, was due to the absence of roads and the consequent difficulty of moving an army in a country so mountainous and a climate so severe; to the scarcity of food for man and beast; and to the fanaticism of the Afghans in the defence of their religion and of their traditional independence. These circumstances constitute obstacles which our continuous military operations, our scientific contrivances, our improved implements of war and the large sums of money lavished by us on the *Máliks* and *Sirdars* who undertook to induce their tribesmen to accept our dominion, have been powerless to overcome. To persist, therefore, in that scheme is to court fresh disasters and humiliations, and to continue spending the revenues of India in the undertaking is to destroy the credit of the Indian Exchequer and hinder the development of Indian industry whence millions of the working classes at home derive their means of subsistence, and thousands of Englishmen obtain honourable and profitable employment.

The British Government, however, have decided on making new efforts to execute the unfortunate and impossible scheme of 1875, and have declared their intention to maintain a British garrison at Kala Drosh in Chitral, and to hold the country about the Malakand pass and Chakdara on the Swat river, leaving the intermediate portion of the road towards India (some sixty miles as the crow flies, but upwards of 120 miles by the winding and hilly road practicable for troops) to be guarded for us by our new friend the Khan of Dir. Under this arrangement, what would our position be at Chitral in the event of a *jehád* (or religious war for the expulsion or extermination of *Káfars*) being proclaimed by the *Mullahs*? Our past dealings with the Afghans can scarcely fail to convince us that, if the Khan of Dir were to join our side in the conflict raised by *jehád*, he would be looked upon as a *Káfar* and be disowned by his own tribesmen. His power and influence would vanish, and his very life might be taken, as the lives of the *Máliks* in Waziristan, whom we called "friendlies" because they accepted our bribes, were taken last year by their own tribesmen. To look for a different course of events, and to expect that the surrounding tribes, when they see the Chitral territory definitely held by an infidel Power, will accept the situation without uniting in a *jehâd* for their deliverance, is to shut one's eyes to the teachings of history. The determination of our Government to hold Chitral may, therefore, be looked upon as the forerunner of another serious catastrophe, and of another war, with no better chance of success than we had in previous wars, undertaken under similar circumstances.

The grounds of the determination to hold Chitral were stated on August 15th by the Prime Minister and the leader of the House of Commons in the following terms. Lord Salisbury said that

> "The Government held the abandonment of Chitral, if defensible as a question of physical strategy, to be most unwise as a question of moral strategy, believing that it would have a detrimental effect on the tribes lying between us and the outer frontier of India;"

and Mr. Balfour said that

> "Her Majesty's Government had come to the conclusion that to retire from Chitral would involve the abandonment of other posts. At Gilghit and at Chitral our troops had made their presence felt; and putting aside all questions of strategy, it would be a serious blow to our prestige, if, after having gone to these territories, we were to abandon them. There were only two powers which had to be considered, and the population of these territories must look to us, and to us alone, as the Suzerain Power."

Thus the obvious aim of both statesmen is to raise British prestige in the East, and to exercise suzerainty over the tribal territories "lying between us and the outer frontier of India," that is, the frontier which we have for so many years vainly striven to acquire. The aim will commend itself to many and its public declaration will doubtless inflame that desire for military glory and territorial aggrandisement which animates almost every nation, as it so strongly animated the French during the first fifteen years of the present century. But how should we stand if that aim were not attained? How if failure, disaster and humiliation resulted instead of the brilliant, the glorious prospects held before the eyes of the nation? Is it unreasonable to apprehend failure and the consequent loss of prestige when these have been the results of every attempt made by us to subjugate the tribes in question, including our recent attempt to subjugate the Waziris?

The apprehension of failure does not extinguish the ardour or shake the determination of a great man or a great nation. Persistence in adverse circumstances, and strong will and energy won many a decisive battle for Napoleon, until, blinded by success, he attempted simultaneously the conquest of Spain and Russia, regardless of the nature of those countries and the character of their people. That error brought upon his country greater ruin and humiliation than it had ever suffered for a thousand years.

J. Dacosta.

LORD ROSEBERY ON CHITRAL.

By An Anglo-Indian.

To the easy-going newspaper reader the debates on the first active day of the new Parliament (which was Thursday, August 15th) may by this time seem like ancient history. It is quite different, though, with those who, on behalf of our unrepresented fellow citizens in the Orient, must write while others sleep; and whose duty it is to keep hold of any threads that pertain to that web of India's destiny which is constantly being woven in secret by authorities mainly irresponsible. In that case the small portions of those opening debates in which Indian affairs were touched upon have still a special interest for our readers, and invite reflection. The contributors to that slight and intermittent conference on the burning Indian topic of the day—the expedition last March into the distant region of the Hindu Kush, and the decision of the late Liberal Ministry to withdraw the Indian Government's forces within its own borders—were four: Lords Rosebery and Salisbury, Sir William Harcourt and Mr. A. J. Balfour. Meagre as their treatment necessarily was of this wide subject, and strange as it is to most English politicians, my own references must now, perforce, be only such as will barely suffice to recall attention to two or three salient points in those speeches.

If one can do nothing more, it is worth while to press our friends to ponder two passages in Lord Rosebery's earnest and concentrated remarks—one touching on practical procedure, the other on a principle of policy. The former is that where his lordship, while pitifully repeating the conventional plaint "I shall wait for papers," went on to "beg" that such documents "shall be fully given as copiously as they were by the late Cabinet," and, especially, that "the opinions of Sir Donald Stewart . . . . shall be given to Parliament in their amplitude and without delay." Now let us consider what is implied, and, indeed what is revealed by this appeal. Here is a statesman who but a few weeks previously had been Prime Minister of England, and, so far, held in his hands our, or, in this instance, India's imperial destinies. Further: he and his colleagues, with all the available evidence before them, had "unanimously" decided on a certain course, which they were fully convinced was the only just and prudent policy to be acted upon in respect of the Indian Government's encroachments and aggressions in High Asia. Pursuant to that well-founded conviction they had issued orders that effect should be given thereto.

At this juncture one of those accidents occurred to which our ricketty parliamentary system is always liable. Another set set of men had suddenly seized on the seals of office and the arsenal of Executive authority. These new men, without any adequate conception of the issues at stake—as the random apologies of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour plainly indicate—proceed to reverse the decision so carefully taken by their predecessors. There is, indeed, the customary excuse, to which Sir William Harcourt so weakly gave credence, that "further information" had been obtained by the new brooms during the few weeks that had elapsed since the decision of their predecessors was settled. That excuse, as is well-known to those who have followed this disastrous story—as set out for months past in these columns and elsewhere—is little better than solemn fooling. The device is too thin to deceive the public, except that section that eagerly desires to deceive others. It will be seen that as soon as the ill-timed and precipitate resignation of Lord Rosebery was telegraphed out, the temporarily checked aggressive faction in India, so to speak, threw up their caps. They, at once, through the officialised press in India and the *Times* telegrams, said, "Go to, we shall now save our game, let the orders from home slide." It only required an official telegram from the wing of that faction at the India Office to invite the Simla group to reconstruct their battered case, and thus to produce those precious "consultations with the Government of India" of which Mr. Balfour spoke.

The all important previous question, to which Lord Rosebery did not even allude, has yet to be answered, namely, why did not the Ministry place those papers before both Houses of Parliament as soon as their decision was taken, and, the more so, seeing that it was known to all the world? It was just by devices of this sort that the causeless and wicked invasion of Afghanistan was rushed into in October, 1878, under the Salisbury-Lytton Government of that day. This systematic sequestration of current public records is the curse of modern Executive procedure; but the leading men of both parties, as we see in the present instance, seem to have lost all true constitutional instinct in these high matters of State.

The one point of principle in regard to Indian polity is that to which Lord Rosebery alluded in saying: "Surely if there is anything we learn from the whole course of Indian history it is that what is wanted for our Indian empire is concentration, both financial and military." This is valuable counsel; and if his lordship will but follow up this conservative policy and show where it must be applied one can readily condone certain defects in his treatment of the present crisis—which were still more noticeable in Sir William Harcourt's loose treatment of such vital topics as "occupation" and "annexation." Lord Rosebery's dignified protest against the flagrant violation of Lord Elgin's proclamation to the Swatis and other tribes, to which breach of faith the present Ministry appear to have committed themselves, is a matter that demands very serious attention. For the rest, what is lacking in this inadequate review may be traced, by those who care to do so, in former papers on the whole subject that have appeared in these columns.

ANGLO-INDIAN.

THE FEAR OF RUSSIAN INVASION.

By DADABHAI NAOROJI.

The common error of persons who discuss the possibilities of Russian invasion of India is to ignore the most important element in the problem, namely, the attitude of the people of British India and of the Native States. This attitude may be either hostile or favourable to British rule. If it is favourable, there is nothing more to be said. Then the British position is invulnerable. But if, on the contrary, there is any likelihood of its being hostile, any argument based upon considerations which ignore that possibility falls to the ground. In that case will the European army be engaged in resisting Russia, or in protecting the European population, scattered all over India, who will be the first and immediate victims of such hostilities? And if the native army sympathise with the hostile feeling of their countrymen, what will be the consequences? Moreover, if any discontent is known to exist among the Indian people, Russia knows well how, by her emissaries, to fan this discontent, and, as in Ireland, the British Government made use of Irish traitors to betray their country, it may be expected that some Indians out of that vast population will be ready to do Russia's work. Russia will bide her time till discontent has fully developed itself, ready to burst into a conflagration. Then Russia not only can, but will, invade India, whether with success or not is another question, but with the result of the destruction of British rule, crushed as it would then be between external invasion and internal trouble. What I want Englishmen to consider is whether such an unfortunate contingency is possible or not, and if possible, to take that most vital element into account in their discussions of the problem.

Let us consider what the probability or possibility is under the present system of British Indian Administration. I repeat the views of British and Anglo-Indian statesmen for a hundred years as to the true character of the present system, saying nothing about the oppression and corruption of the previous period. Sir John Shore (1787) pointed out that whatever might be the increased industry of the people, the benefits of it would be more than counterbalanced by the evils of the present system. The natural inference from this view is that the effect of the system must be impoverishment. This prophecy has been fulfilled. In 1833 Macaulay characterised the system as that of holding Indians as slaves and keeping them too poor to be able to buy British goods. (1837) Mr. F. Shore described the system as a sordid system of misrule to which the interests of millions had been sacrificed for the benefit of the few, and of grinding extortion which effected impoverishment to an extent almost unparalleled. (1858) Mr. Bright referred to the system as plundering India. (1859) Sir George Wingate characterised the system as exacting a cruel and crushing tribute. (1864) Lord Lawrence (Viceroy) stated that the mass of the people enjoyed only a scanty subsistence. To come down to later days, (1875) Lord Salisbury (Secretary of State for India) pointed out that the injury was exaggerated in the case of India, where so much of the revenue was exported without a direct equivalent, and declared the policy of the system to be that India must be bled. (1880) Sir William Hunter considered that forty years hence the British people would have an Indian Ireland multiplied fifty-fold on their hands. (1882) Lord Cromer (Finance Minister) described the people of India as extremely poor. (1886) Lord Randolph Churchill (Secretary of State for India) described the system as constituting a political danger which the Government had long regarded as of the most serious order. (1886) Sir Auckland Colvin (Finance Minister) said that the income of the mass of the people, at the best, was barely sufficient to afford them the sustenance necessary to support life. I need not say anything about the complete confusion in which India is at present.

The natural consequences of this system are the opium trade, poisoning a vast nation, the salt tax, oppressive exaction of revenue, general extreme poverty, destruction of millions by famine, and the starving, underfed condition of some scores of millions.

Can any man in his senses doubt for a moment that the inevitable result of such a state of affairs must be discontent? Could anything be more foolish than hiding the head under the sand, as the statesmen of the present day are doing, thinking that Indians do not see and understand the evil system with which British India is afflicted?

I need not say much about the possible attitude of the native princes. They are, from a clear sense of their own interests, thoroughly loyal to British supremacy. But the Indian Foreign Office and political agencies unfortunately are keeping up chronic interference, and have again begun nibbling at the power of the princes, as in the fifties, short of annexation. If the princes become hostile, the fault will lie entirely at the door of the present system. Otherwise these princes have every reason to desire the supremacy of the British hand.

Next, the British word is coming to command less confidence in the mind of Indians. The people generally cannot quite clearly make the distinction between the British people and their servants, the Anglo-Indian authorities both here and in India. Though the British people and Parliament have repeatedly laid down the policy of righteousness, Anglo-Indian authorities have persistently, barefacedly, and perversely ignored and thwarted the resolutions and Acts of Parliament and the most solemn pledges and proclamations. No department here would dare to ignore a resolution or Act of Parliament on matters concerning this country. But there is hardly a resolution, an Act of Parliament, a proclamation, or a pledge for the promotion of the true welfare of the Indians which the Anglo-Indian authorities have not ignored, resisted, and made a dead letter. A Viceroy (Lord Lytton, 1878) confesses that the Indian authorities had used every device, deceit, and subterfuge to defeat the policy of the British people and Parliament. Lord Salisbury (1883) declared that all pledges, voluntary acts, etc, were so much political hypocrisy. Such, at present, are the dark colours with which the servants of the British people have covered their good name.

Again, to the expenditure of the Indian revenues, by which Great Britain derives the benefit of the greatest empire the world has ever seen, she does not contribute a single farthing from the British exchequer. All must be paid by the Indians as British helots. Further, the birthright of British subjects is—"taxation without representation is tyranny." But the Indians have no voice in the raising or disbursement of their revenues. What is worse still, they are treated with distrust as candidates for the higher civil or military services. In the latter they have no share at all. Under these circumstances is it reasonable, is it common sense, to expect loyalty and hearty patriotic support from Indians in a time of trouble?

Now I ask Englishmen to take into account in their problem this most vital element: if the system of the present despotism, drain, and distrust are continued, sooner or later, perhaps sooner, if Indian human nature is like all other human nature, great trouble will ensue, whether Russia can invade or not. Invasion by Russia sinks into insignificance compared with the troubles that the British Indian system itself is storing up. I have been crying in the wilderness for a long time. But I have faith in the British people, and if they set themselves to consider these questions there is hope that the position of affairs in India may yet mend before it is too late. Vast and great forces are rapidly developing themselves through one of the several beneficent acts of the British people themselves—the dissemination of education (though at India's own expense). It is for British statesmen to draw these forces to their own side before they turn against them. If the internal problem is satisfactorily solved, we may quite contentedly leave Russia to her own devices. Indians, if trusted instead of being distrusted, if satisfied with British rule as a rule of righteousness and beneficence, will fight for British rule as for their own hearths and homes as patriots.

The British people and Parliament have been making the most solemn pledges for more than sixty years by Resolutions, by Acts of Parliament, and by Proclamations in the name of the British people, and by the mouth of the Sovereign. The Indian authorities, on the other hand, have been violating these pledges in letter and in spirit with unblushing openness. The British people have pledged themselves to treat Indians as British subjects. But the British Indian system actually treats them as mere subjects of a foreign despotic rule. Can any Englishman in his senses be blind to the consequences of such conduct?

Afflicted as India is with the impoverishing European Services, and with the indirect help of these Services in enabling other Europeans and European capital to exploit India in every possible way for their own benefit, what can be expected from the Indians? I say again, and say it with all earnestness, that the present system of administration and the financial treatment of India is full of most serious danger.

Indian reformers are very properly fighting the "forward" frontier policy tooth-and-nail. But even if the Cabinet decided to-day to put an end to it, that would be a relief from only a part of the aggravation of the principal Indian evil. The progress of events in India is tending to an inevitable catastrophe. The Indian National Congress is exerting itself to check this tendency.

Our efforts must not be confined to the question of the "forward" frontier policy. Of course it would be a great and immediate gain to check it, but the danger of internal rebellion and external invasion would remain the same. On the other hand, if India were treated righteously, if she prospered, and felt it a patriotism to be loyal to British supremacy, both the present "forward" policy and the danger of a foreign invasion would vanish of themselves. No truer words have been uttered than those of Lord Roberts when he said: "However efficient and well equipped the army of India may be, were it indeed absolute perfection, and were its numbers considerably more than they are at present, our greatest strength must ever rest on the firm base of a united and contented India." Yet, strange to say, Lord Roberts himself advocates the wasting of money, energy and life on the "forward" policy, and the violation of the solemn pledges of the British to the Indian people, thereby adopting the most effective means of producing a disunited and discontented India. Let there be a contented, and not distressed, British India, and Englishmen may snap their fingers at any external danger. Dadabhai Naoroji.

EX UNO DISCE OMNES.

By Alfred Webb, M.P.,
President of the Indian National Congress.

When at Bombay in the early part of this year, I was made aware of deep and general feelings of dissatisfaction among certain classes of the community, regarding recent increased assessments of land revenue in the Kolaba district, situated seven or eight miles away, on the opposite of the Bay. The increases amounted to 45 per cent. in the Panwel subdivision, and to 33 per cent. in the Alibag subdivision: that on individual properties had been as much as from 200 per cent. to 1,100 per cent.: although there had been an understood rule or engagement on the part of the Government that there should be no increase above 33 per cent. on a taluka or district, and no increase above 66 per cent. on a particular village.

Visiting the district, I satisfied myself of the wretched poverty in which most of the poor population are wearing out their lives. Their faces and bearing evinced touching, self-forgetful, patient endurance. I recognized how, as was universally the case in my own country until of late years, and is so still to some extent, individual frugality and effort are discouraged by a steady rise in charges on land in proportion to the frugality and industry of the tenant. I perceived that some of these assessments were levied on the extraordinary principle of valuing land, not by its actual crops, but by what, in the estimation of the Government, it might, could, would, or should, under certain circumstances, produce. I had an opportunity of gauging the intense dissatisfaction and feeling of unrest in the district —a dissatisfaction whose existence could not be simulated.

I have studied the newspaper correspondence and other documents in which the case of the people of the district has been stated: I have read the official documents, furnished me by the India Office, in which the Bombay Government justify their policy of enhancement.

I have not been able to clear my mind of the impression that grave injustice is being perpetrated in the name of law.

I have laid my views personally and by letter, in a manner acknowledged to be "temperate," before those most responsible for the right government of the Indian people.

Questions regarding the valuation of land for assessments or rent are necessarily complicated. They cannot be settled off-hand on consideration of particular cases, stated by writers in newspapers, or by passing observers like myself, however afterwards at a distance they may endeavour, by examination of documentary evidence, to arrive at the truth.

All the people of the district desire, all their friends in Bombay desire, all I desire and have urged, is that an *independent* enquiry should be held upon the spot into the whole circumstances and justice of the assessment. But no! the conclusion of the argument, so far, is summed up in a letter received by me from the India Office last month, in which it is stated:—

> "Mr. Fowler does not see ground for ordering a general enquiry into the appropriateness of the revised assessments. At the same time it is possible that, in regard to particular holdings, errors of detail may have crept in; and he is confident that, if such errors are proved, the Bombay Government and its revenue officers will be ready and anxious to remedy them. The landowners should bring their cases, where mistakes have been made, to the notice of the local government and its officers."

The "Bombay Government and its revenue officers," "the local government and its officers," are those by whom the assessments were made and were sustained, those who have hitherto through a long argument vehemently maintained their fairness and moderation. It is the direct interest of that government and these officials that such assessments should be raised and maintained as high as possible.

To refer assessments for revision to the officials who have made and sustained them, and whose interest it is to have done so, is a travesty of the principles upon which a great people ought to be governed or can continue to be governed.

I do not question the high character and good intentions of these authorities. But human nature is the same all the world over, and no men are competent to be arbiters in difficult cases where their own interests and pride are concerned. I have seen enough of this in Ireland, and the utter failure of excellent men who considered themselves God-given final judges over people of a cognate race and religion. How much more difficult must it be to rule fairly where officials are mostly of a different race and religion as in India—how much more careful should a wise Government be there, in such cases as that to which I desire to draw attention, by readily granting independent enquiry, to remove all dissatisfaction, all possibility of injustice.

Alfred Webb.

SOME SUPERFLUOUS OFFICES AND OFFICERS IN THE BRITISH ADMINISTRATION OF INDIA.

By Parbati C. Roy, B.A.
Sometime Member of the Bengal Uncovenanted Service.

I.—The Council of the Secretary of State.

It is a characteristic feature of the British Rule in India that offices and officers are still retained though the necessity for their existence no longer continues. The Government does not move with the requirements of good administration, but tenaciously holds to institutions which though useful at the beginning have now grown old and effete. The most noticeable instance of this is furnished by the Council of the Secretary of State. When the government of

India passed from the East India Company to the Crown, it was no doubt a cautious measure to provide the Secretary of State with a Council. But during the forty years in which this Council has been in existence it has done little or nothing to justify its further continuance. No new measures are initiated in this Council, which deals only with questions submitted to the Secretary of State by the Viceroy in Council, who generally deals with matters submitted by local governments after consulting their chief subordinate officers, who, in their turn, consult their subordinates. In this way, matters are examined from all possible points of view before they are laid before the Secretary of State who has simply to decide on the facts submitted to him. In doing this the Secretary of State has the advantage of the services of not only the permanent Under Secretary, but of the Departmental Secretaries as well. These Departmental Secretaries are chosen from amongst officers who have held the high posts of Lieutenant-Governors, Chief Commissioners and Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council. As the members of the Secretary of State's Council are also appointed from amongst these officers they cannot be superior in knowledge or experience to the Departmental Secretaries.

No human institution is perfect. With all the best intentions and endeavours on the part of Government, mistakes often occur, and it is not likely that more mistakes will occur than at present if the Secretary of State's Council is abolished. Even now the Departmental Secretaries, and not the members of the Council, perform the work that appears in the name of the Council, whose work consists, as a rule, in putting initials to "Notes" submitted by Departmental Secretaries. Further it will appear on enquiry that the results of the deliberation of the Council are almost invariably to sanction the proposals of the Government of India so that in these cases the services of the Council are not required. In difficult cases the work now done by the Council might be left in the hands of the Secretary of State assisted by the Departmental Secretaries. That the Secretary of State and not his Council rules at the India Office can easily be inferred from the final decision in the Chitral case. When Sir Henry Fowler was the Secretary of State the evacuation of Chitral was decided upon, but that decision has been upset by his successor. It would indeed be a revelation to know what the opinion of the Council was in each case.

If the Royal Commission on Indian Finance will call for a statement showing the number of cases that came up last year before the Council, the number in which orders were passed on the "Notes" submitted by Departmental Secretaries, the number in which members recorded minutes, the number in which the proposals of the Government of India were sanctioned, the number in which they were rejected, the number of days during which each member attended the office, the average daily number of hours during which he remained in the office, and the average number of cases he daily disposed of, it will appear how very little work was done in return for the thousand pounds a year he received for doing this work in addition to an equal amount of pension.

But the Council is not only useless; it is often positively injurious to the interests of good government in India. The members are mostly worn out Anglo-Indians whose knowledge of Indians as they at present are, is next to nothing. As a consequence of this, they are enemies to progress. This is manifest from the virulent attacks they make on the Indians and their unfitness to hold high executive and judicial posts in their country. If they had seen India of the present day they would not have used arguments full of fallacies against holding simultaneous examinations both in India and in England for the Civil Service. When a member is once appointed to the Council he continues there until death carries him away from this world.

In these advanced days, when decentralisation and not centralisation is the recognised principle with most Governments it is a retrograde movement to govern India from England. Certain broad rules of action should be laid down for the guidance of the Viceroy and his Council and within those rules they should have entire freedom of action, and it is only in cases not covered by the rules that a reference should be made to the Secretary of State. As these will be the cases involving general policy, the Secretary of State should, with the aid of his Departmental Secretaries, be able to deal with them satisfactorily. India should be treated like the Colonies and the Office of the Secretary of State for India should be similar to that of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

II.—The Commissioners of Divisions and Board of Revenue.

The Commissioners of Revenue and Circuit, now called Commissioners of Divisions, were first appointed in Bengal and the North-West Provinces under Regulation III. of 1828. The preamble to this Regulation gives the following reasons for the creation of these appointments.

> "The system in operation for superintending the magistrates and the police and for controlling and directing the Executive Revenue Officers who in several cases are also magistrates has been found to be defective. The Provincial Courts of Appeal and Circuit as now constituted, partly from the extent of country placed under their authority and partly from their having to discharge the duties of both civil and criminal tribunals have, in many cases, failed to afford that prompt administration of justice which it is the duty of Government to secure for the people. The gaol deliveries have been in some instances delayed beyond the term prescribed by law. . . . and a great arrear of cases under appeal has accrued in all the courts to the manifest injury of many individuals, and to the encouragement of litigation and crime. The judges of circuit when employed singly in the districts under their authority do not possess sufficient powers, nor have they the opportunity of acquiring sufficient local knowledge to enable them adequately to control the police or protect the people. The great extent of country under each of the Boards of Revenue has similarly operated to impede them in the execution of the duties which belong to them as tribunals for the determination of all questions relative to the assessment of lands under settlement and for the judicial decision of many other important cases as the general guardian of the fiscal interests of the State, as directors and superintendents over the executive officers and as the confidential advisers of Government. For the correction of the above defects it has appeared to be expedient and necessary to place the magistracy and police and the collectors and other executive revenue officers under the superintendence and control of commissioners of revenue and circuit. . . . to confide to the said commissioners the powers now vested in the courts of circuit, together with those that belong to the boards

of revenue, to be exercised with the modifications herein after provided, the former under the authority of the Nizamat Adalat and the latter under the instruction and control of the Sadr or Chief Board of Revenue, and altogether to disjoin the functions of the courts of circuit from those of appeal."

Now let us see if the reasons assigned seventy years ago for the creation of Commissionerships exist at present. The Commissioners no longer perform the functions of Circuit Judges, the trial of criminal cases having been transferred to the Sessions Judges. They are no longer the superintendents of police, which has its own departmental head called the Inspector-General of Police with Deputy Inspectors-General under him. Like the police, the excise is a separate department under an officer called the Excise Commissioner. The department of Settlement has its own head in the Director of Land Records. The Registration department has its Inspector-General and the Education department its Director. The office of the Commissioner of Divisions is no more than a post office as regards the above departments. Nay, it is worse than a post office. It causes delay in the despatch of business. Indeed, in urgent cases, the departmental officers correspond with their chiefs direct, sending to the Commissioner only a copy of their letter. Such being the case, the Commissioners are quite useless as regards the above departments. They are not only useless but often harmful. They do not possess the knowledge and experience of the departmental chiefs, and they put obstructions in the way of the latter by their imperiousness and obstructiveness. The only departments which have not been separately organised are the Court of Wards, the Butwara or Partition, the Income Tax and a few miscellaneous ones. Surely, a Commissioner is not required for looking after them. Either the Commissioners should be abolished or the newly created departments done away with. But that the latter course would not be conducive to good government is evident from the circumstance that the supervision of the Commissioner was not found sufficient in these cases. Otherwise there would have been no necessity for creating the new departments. The most proper course would therefore be to abolish Commissionerships of divisions, and create a few Commissioners of departments like the Excise Commissioner, with their headquarters in Calcutta. If, however, it is deemed inexpedient, for administrative reasons, to do away altogether with the Commissioners, who are so many Sub-Lieutenant-Governors, their number should certainly be reduced. The Commissioners no longer try any criminal cases. The resumption suits under Regulation II of 1819 which they tried as successors to the Special Commissioners have long since been finished and there are no works for them on that side. Police, Excise, Land Settlements, Registration, and Education have their respective departments, and do not require the supervision of the Divisional Commissioners. In view of the above circumstances one Commissioner can easily do the work now done by two, especially as the facilities for communication have been so vastly improved by the construction of railways of late years.

The Government of Sir Rivers Thompson took up in earnest the question of abolishing the Board of Revenue in Bengal, and it is an open secret that the Board was suffered to exist not because its existence was necessary for the purposes of good government, but because its abolition would have reduced the number of high appointments available to members of the Civil Service. That it is not the nature of the duties performed by a civilian that decides the question of pay is apparent from the manner in which Government regulated the salary of the Excise Commissioner. When that appointment was first created the pay was fixed at Rs. 2,500, but on the promotion of the first Excise Commissioners to a Divisional Commissionership the post was given to an officer holding the post of a second grade magistrate on Rs. 1,800 without any increment of salary. It is believed that the present Excise Commissioner is discharging his duties as well as his predecessor did. This shows how Government can manage to reduce the salary attached to a post without impairing its efficiency. A civilian does not require much experience to become a magistrate-collector. On the 1st of April, 1894, there were four assistants acting as magistrate-collectors. Three of these had been a little more than six years in the country, and the fourth hardly over four years—facts which clearly prove that the work of a district officer does not require great experience. In fact, it would appear that any civilian, however low in the service, is capable of holding any post howsoever high. What a commentary, this, on the good government of India by England! Further proof that it is superfluous to continue both the Board of Revenue and the Commissioners of Divisions in one and the same Province is furnished by Bombay and Madras. In the former Province there is no Board of Revenue, and in the latter there are no Commissioners. Yet it cannot be said that they are not as well governed as Bengal and the North-West Provinces.

III.—The Department of Public Works.

Under the preceding two heads I have shown the superfluity of office. I shall now try to prove the superfluity of officers in the Department of Public Works. This Department superintends Government Buildings, State Railways, Imperial Roads and Canals. Now most of the districts have been provided with their office and gaol building and with Imperial roads and bridges. All that is necessary as regards these old works is to attend to their repairs. This might safely be intrusted to the less highly paid officers appointed in India. The costly recruits from Cooper's Hill might be employed in looking after new works. The ordinary Canal and Railway works might also be left in the hands of Indians under the supervision of men appointed from Cooper's Hill. In this way large savings might be effected in expenditure.

Sir Charles Elliott has, in Bengal, introduced certain reforms to the above effect, whereby he has saved Rs. 50,000 a year in the expenditure annually incurred. He has not carried out the reforms in the Railway and Canal Departments and increased the number of more highly paid superintending engineers. Still he deserves credit for what he has done. His example should be followed in the other Provinces and Administrations, with this difference, that Indians should not be entirely excluded from the higher posts when they are found fit for them. Sir Charles Elliott, in pursuit of his avowed policy of refusing to entrust Bengalis with high administrative offices, has reserved the superintending engineerships for his countrymen only. Of course he does not say so in his resolution, but the Bengalis are conspicuous by their absence from the higher grades. This is in keeping with Sir Charles Elliott's statement to the correspondent of *Black and White* to the effect that the Bengalis make good subordinate officers but are unfit for offices of control.

Parbati C. Roy.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

FURTHER MEMORANDUM BY THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

In addition to the "Note" and the "Memorandum" on Indian Finance which were recently prepared by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, and put in for the consideration of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, a further Memorandum has now been drawn up by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., and Mr. H. Morgan-Browne. From this document we cite the following:

Increase of Military Expenditure.

The total increase in Net Military Expenditure of the Government of India compared with 1884-5 is as follows in 1894-5 and 1895-6 (*Budget Estimate*), respectively:—[N.B. In the following figures that part of the cost of exchange which is due solely to the fall in exchange has been excluded, as also the additional rupee pay of the British soldier due to the same cause.]

Increase in Net Military Expenditure as Compared with 1884-5.

1894-5 (*Revised Estimate*).

		Rx.	Rx.
1. Army:—			
Increase in India		2,484,867	
Increase in England:—			
Sterling	£398,897		
Exchange ..	Rx. 332,414		
		731,311	
Exchange Compensation ..		518,600	
			3,734,778
2. Military Works (including Exchange Compensation):—			
Increase in India		5,671	
Increase in England:—			
Sterling	£18,429		
Exchange ..	Rx. 15,357		
		33,786	
			39,457
Special Defence Works:—			
India		70,400	
England:—			
Sterling	£62,300		
Exchange ..	Rx. 51,917		
		114,217	
			184,617
Total Net Increase			Rx. 3,958,852

Increase in Net Military Expenditure as Compared with 1884-5.

1895-6 (*Budget Estimate*).

		Rx.	Rx.
1. Army:—			
Increase in India		3,411,267	
Increase in England:—			
Sterling	£487,197		
Exchange ..	Rx. 405,997		
		893,194	
Exchange Compensation ..		610,000	
			4,914,461
2. Military Works (including Exchange Compensation):—			
Increase in India		188,271	
Increase in England:—			
Sterling	£10,929		
Exchange ..	Rx. 9,108		
		20,037	
			208,308
3. Special Defence Works:—			
India		70,000	
England:—			
Sterling	£46,200		
Exchange ..	Rx. 38,500		
		84,700	
			154,700
Total Net Increase			Rx. 5,277,469

With regard to Military Expenditure generally the following points seem to deserve special attention.

(*a*) During the ten years 1875-6 to 1884-5 the total cost of special operations (excluding, of course, the Afghan and Egyptian Wars) was only Rx. 161,562, incurred in 1875-6 and 1884-5, while during the ten years from 1885-6 to 1894-5 (excluding the charges on account of Upper Burma) no less than Rx. 4,925,877 was expended on special operations. The following table shows the yearly expenditure during the two periods, side by side.

Special Operations.

	Rx.		Rx.
1875-76	2,643	1885-86	2,190,124
1876-77	—	1886-87	—
1877-78	—	1887-88	15,541
1878-79	—	1888-89	374,378
1879-80	—	1889-90	420,988
1880-81	—	1890-91	399,560
1881-82	—	1891-92	751,836
1882-83	—	1892-93	257,300
1883-84	—	1893-94	273,650
1884-85	158,919	1894-95	242,500
Total..	Rx. 161,562	Total..	Rx. 4,925,877

If the estimate of Rx. 318,900 for 1895-6 and Rx. 1,750,000 for the Chitral Expedition be added, it will be seen that during the twelve years 1884-5 to 1895-6 Rx. 7,153,696 has been spent on these special operations.

(*b*) *Special Defence Works.*—The scheme of special defence works, started in 1886-7, is now approaching completion, hence the small amount shown under this head; but during the ten years from 1886-7 to

1895-6 a total net expenditure of Rx. 4,479,738 was incurred on this account.

(*c*) *Special Military Expenditure.* — During the twelve years 1884-5 to 1895-6 over and above a large increase in ordinary Military Expenditure (*i.e.*, Army and Military Works), and excluding all charges on account of Upper Burma, and the cost of frontier railways, special and extraordinary expenditure has been incurred to the amount of Rx. 11.633,434.

(*d*) *Strategic Frontier Railways.*—In recent years large sums have been spent on unreproductive frontier railways built and maintained purely for military purposes. Such expenditure is obviously military, and the burden thereof ought not to be thrown on the general railway enterprise of the Government of India; nor should it be met otherwise than out of revenue, unless it should be deemed necessary to raise a special loan for the purpose.

POLITICAL CHARGES.

The following figures show the details of the increase in the Political charges, Imperial and Provincial, in India in 1893-4 (the latest detailed figures available) as compared with 1884-5. [N.B. There was a slight decrease in the total Political charges in India in 1894-5 as compared with 1893-4, but for 1895 6 there is an estimated further increase. The figures for 1893-4 include Rx.15,824 on account of Exchange Compensation Allowance.]

INCREASE OF POLITICAL CHARGES IN INDIA, 1881-5 TO 1893-4.

	1884-5.	1893-4.	Increase (+) or decrease(—).
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Political Agents ..	257,167	338,151	+80,984
Charges on North-West Frontier ..	67,015	124.615	+57,570
Political Subsidies..	133,553	231,060	+97,507
Entertainments and Presents	33,097	27,579	—5,518
Refugees and State Prisoners ..	41,307	81,892	+40,585
Miscellaneous ..	44,148	34,041	—10,107
Afghan Delimitation Commission ..	182,950	——	—182,950
Special Political Expenditure: Cabul, Sikkim, Gilghit, Kurram, Chitral Missions, etc., etc.	——	57,656	+57,656
Organising Imperial Service Troops ..	——	20,117	+20,117
Expenditure against certain Revenues	——	14,489	+14,489
Total ..	Rx.759,267	929,600	+170,333

If the charge for Exchange Compensation Allowance be deducted the Net increase would be Rx.154,509. Properly speaking the charges for the Afghan Delimitation Commission ought to be excluded as temporary expenditure, when it would appear that the permanent political charges, excluding Exchange Compensation, have increased by Rx 337,459 during the last ten years. In this connexion it would be desirable to know what was the estimate and what has been the actual cost from first to last of the Gilghit Agency in the past, and what it is estimated to be in the future.

EXCHANGE.

With regard to Exchange, official calculations show a total increase in the ten years of Rx. 11,156,204 which is made up as follows:—

INCREASE IN COST OF EXCHANGE.	1884-5 to 1894-5.
	Rx.
On Net Sterling Expenditure......	9,602,221
On Remittance Accounts	—177,917
In Soldiers' Pay	950,000
For Exchange Compensation	781,900
Total Net Increase....	Rx. 11,156,204

It may be stated once for all that the only portion of the increased burden of Exchange which may be properly said to be outside the control of the Government of India, and therefore properly excluded from comparisons of Expenditure from year to year, is the cost of remittance to England of the amount of the sterling charges at the beginning of any given period under examination, and the additional Rupee pay of British troops (whose pay is on a sterling basis). As owing to the fall in Exchange this charge automatically increases without any voluntary addition to Government Expenditure, it is necessary to show it separately; but any increase in the charge for Exchange due to Exchange Compensation Allowance, or to an increase in the Home Charges, is part and parcel of such additional Expenditure, clearly foreseen, and necessarily provided for at the time of such increase.

If, at a time when £100 of expenditure in England costs the Government of India Rx.150, £100 be added to the Home Charges, obviously although Rx. 50 of this additional expenditure will appear in the column headed Exchange, this Rx. 50 is as much additional expenditure as is the Rx. 100 which is made nominally to represent the £100. Further, if at a time of falling Exchange the Government of India incur additional sterling expenditure, whether by necessity or otherwise they must be taken to have incurred at the time whatever of additional expenditure it may ultimately cost to provide that additional amount in gold. In ascertaining the increased cost of Exchage in Net Sterling Expenditure for any given period the only increase properly due to Exchange is the increased cost of remitting, at the end of the period, the amount of the Sterling Expenditure at the beginning thereof.

In 1884-5 the Net Sterling Expenditure of the Government of India was	£13,792,555
Costing for Exchange (*i.e.*, in addition to Rs. 10 or Rx. 1 for every £1)	Rx. 3,351,479
Or a total cost of ..	Rx. 17,144,034
In 1894-5 the cost of remitting £13,792,555 to England was ..	,, 25,286,301
Or an increase, due solely to the fall in Exchange, of	Rx.8,142,267

The following figures therefore show how the increase in the cost of Exchange should be presented :—

INCREASE IN COST OF EXCHANGE, 1884-5 TO 1894-5.

	Rx.	Rx.
On Net Sterling Expenditure as in 1884-5 ..	8,142,267	
In Soldiers' Pay	950,000	
Automatic Increase in Exchange	9,092,267	
On Remmittance Accounts .	—177,917	
Net automatic increase in Exchange	..	8,914,350
On Additional Sterling Expenditure since 1884-5 ..	1,459,954	
On Exchange Compensation	781,900	
Net increase due to New Expenditure	..	.. 2,241,854
Total		Rx. 11,156,204

With regard to the increase of Rx. 9,092,267 automatically due to the fall in Exchange it is very important to note how the incidence of this heavy charge is distributed among the main heads of Expenditure. Dividing the Expenditure into four main heads—I. CIVIL SERVICES (including *Civil Departments*, *Miscellaneous Civil Charges*, *Buildings and Roads*, and an insignificant increase of Rx. 200 under *Famine Insurance*—included in order to agree the total—but excluding *Direct Demands on the Revenues*, *i.e.*, Rx. 59,493) ; II. MILITARY SERVICES (including *Army*, *Military Works*, and *Special Defence Works*) ; III. DEBT SERVICES (*i.e.*, *Interest*) ; and IV. COMMERCIAL SERVICES (including *Post Office and Telegraphs*, *Mint*, *Railways* and *Irrigation*), the following figures show how the burden of the Rx. 9,092,267 is borne :—

AUTOMATIC INCREASE IN COST OF EXCHANGE, 1884-5 TO 1894-5.

		Rx.
I.	Civil Services ..	1,294,414
II.	Military Services ..	3,259,283
III.	Debt Services ..	1,521,716
IV.	Commercial Services .	3,016,854
	Total ..	Rx. 9,092,267

Now it must be remembered that the increase of Rx. 3,016,854 under the head of Commercial Services does not all represent actual increase of Expenditure, but, as a set-off to the increased returns from the Indian Government's commercial undertakings, largely represents the diversion of potential revenue. In spite of this heavy additional charge, the total net cost of the Commercial Services to the Government of India in 1894-5 was only Rx. 2,787,500 as against Rx. 1,972,171 in 1884-5 [the average annual net cost has been about Rx. 2,048,000 during the last twenty years, 1875-6—1894-5], or an increase of Rx. 815,329. Again, in spite of the increase of Rx. 1,521,716 under the head of Debt Services, the total net expenditure of the Government of India for Interest in 1884-5 was only Rx. 3,959,800 (excluding Rx. 301,000 exceptional expenditure on account of "anticipation interest and brokerage paid in respect of the conversion of the 4 per cent debt " *Vide* F. S. 1895-6, para. 21) as against Rx. 3,907,848 in 1884-5, or an increase of Rx. 51,952. Consequently under the two heads of *Debt*, and *Commercial Services*, the automatic increase in the cost of Exchange, amounting to Rx. 4,538,570 (nearly half the total burden), although it has prevented a very considerable improvement, has only caused an actual addition to expenditure of Rx. 867,281. The total additional expenditure entailed upon the Government of India in 1894-5 by the automatic increase in the net cost of Exchange since 1884-5 is therefore Rx. 5,420,978, or, including Rx. 28,333 on account of the Cost of Collection of the Revenue (*i.e.*, Rx. 59,493, less the Charge for Exchange Compensation allowance—Rx. 31,160—and trifling amounts in connection with opium, and increased sterling charges) a total, of Rx. 5,449,311. The following contrast is instructive :—

Principal Additions to Net Expenditure 1884-5—1894-5.

On account of the automatic increase in the cost of Exchange	Rx.5,449,311
On account of increased Civil and Military Charges :—	
Civil Services (*vide* para. 23) Rx.5,517,276 Military Services (*vide* para. 16) .. Rx.3,958,852	Rx.9,476,128

With regard to the Debt official calculations show a large reduction in the ordinary debt during the last ten years :—

INCREASE IN DEBT SINCE END OF FINANCIAL YEAR 1884-5.

Increase in India	Rx.11,161,894
,, ,, England	£44,734,738
Total	Rx.55,896,632
Debt transferred to Public Works	,, 65,392,589
Net decrease in the ordinary Debt	Rx.9,495,957

This large decrease in ordinary Debt of Rx.9,495,957 is entirely illusory. The fallacy consists in taking the increase of £44,734,738 in sterling Debt as only equivalent to an increase of Rx.44,734,738 and then setting off against it what is largely rupee expenditure on public works. The following table shows the equivalent in tens-of-rupees of this £44,734,738.

Year.	Increase of Gold Debt.	Rate of Exchange.	Equivalent in tens-of-Rupees.
	£	*d.*	Rx.
1885-86	4,535,533	18·254	5,963,229
1886-87	10,421,556	17·441	14,340,760
1887-88	—88,029	16·898	—125,026
1888-89	10,893,462	16·379	15,962,090
1889-90	3,158,781	16·566	4,576,285
1890-91	6,215,817	18·090	8,246,523
1891-92	2,995,935	16·733	4,297,044
1892-93	—720,376	14·985	—1,153,755
1893-94	1,430,025	14·547	2,359,290
1894-95	5,892,034	13·090	10,802,812
TOTAL ..	£44,734,738		Rx. 65,269,252

Again, the Rx.65,392,589 transferred to Public Works contains a sum of £19,943,152 treated as equivalent to Rx.19,943,152, besides a large amount of sterling expenditure duly converted into Rx. at the current rate of exchange. This sum of £19,943,152 is made up of three separate amounts raised in 1886-7, 1888-9, and 1890-1, shown in column 21 of a Table at page 195 of the Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1893-4; and, when converted into Rx. at the rates of Exchange for those three years respectively, is equivalent to Rx.28,133,680. Consequently the amount transferred to Public Works should be shown as Rx.73,583,117.

Making these corrections, the following figures show the true state of the case:

INCREASE IN DEBT SINCE END OF FINANCIAL YEAR 1884-5.

		Rx.
Increase in India		11,161,894
Increase in England	£44,734,738 =	65,269,252
Total Increase in Debt ..		Rx.76,431,146
Deduct Amount transferred to Public Works		Rx.73,583,117
Net Increase in Ordinary Debt (ten years)		Rx.2,848,029

Obviously if £1 = Rs. 18⅓ as at present, £1,000,000 sterling raised in England, whether applied to the ordinary purposes of Government or to redeeming debt (whether gold or silver), and whether remitted to India or used in reduction of the Secretary of State's drawings in Bills on India, must either produce Rx.1,833,000 in India on Exchange or—which comes to the same thing—set free that amount in the hands of the Government of India for other purposes. Consequently, to show Rx.1,000,000 of expenditure on Public Works as a set off-to £1,000,000 of sterling debt without first reducing the sterling to a rupee denomination appears to be indefensible.

Review.

THE VEDANTA PHILOSOPHY.

A Lecture on the Vedanta Philosophy. By BABU M. L. BHATTACHARYA, M.A., Professor of Sanskrit, Agra College. Agra: Mokerji Brothers.

Professor Bhattacharya delivered this lecture to the Agra College Literary Society, and many students of Indian wisdom will be glad that he has now offered it to the public. He professes to deal with the philosophical phase of the Vedanta system exclusively, treating it with marked ability and with a sympathetic fidelity that sometimes seems to go far to warp his judgment. The Vedanta—the conclusion, end or scope, or final object of the Veda—is, in its philosophical aspect, the chief of the six orthodox Hindu systems. It teaches Adwaita, non-duality or monism—absolute unity, according to Sankara; non-duality with a difference, according to Ramanuja. It is the teaching of Sankara that Professor Bhattacharya follows, for it "is considered the most important of all Vedantic systems on account of the sublimity of its thoughts and subtlety of its arguments." Without following him into details, we may quote his summary of Sankara's exposition:

> "Whatever is, is in reality one. There truly exists only one universal Being, called Brahman or Paramatman—the highest self. It is pure being, *i.e.*, pure intelligence or thought. Brahman is not a thinking being, but thought itself. It is absolutely destitute of qualities. This Brahman is associated with a certain power called Avidya, or Nescience, to which the whole world is due for its very existence. It is, as it were, a principle of illusion. Being associated with this principle, Brahman projects the appearance of the world in the same way as a magician produces illusory appearances of things. Brahman, in so far as it is associated with Maya, may be called the material cause of the world. Brahman, in this view, is called Iswara, the ruler of the universe. Maya, under the guidance of this Iswara, modifies itself by progressive evolution into all the individual existences, distinguished by special names and forms, of which the world consists. In all those apparently individual forms of existence, the one invisible Brahman is present, but, on account of Maya, it appears to be broken up into a multitude of intellectual or sentient principles, the Jivas or individual souls. The whole aggregate of physical organs and mental functions, which separate one Jiva from another, is the offspring of Maya, and, as such, is not really true.
>
> "The non-enlightened soul cannot look through and beyond Maya, which, like a veil, hides from it its true nature. It blindly identifies itself with its bodily organism, and burdens itself with merits and demerits, which are the causes of its birth or rebirth, while Iswara allots to each soul the form of embodiment to which it is entitled by its previous actions. At the end of each of the great world-periods or Kalpas, Iswara draws back the whole world into himself, which is then dissolved into non-distinct Maya, while the individual souls remain in a condition resembling deep slumber, which is the nature of undeveloped Maya. After some time Iswara sends forth a new material world, and the old round of birth, and action, and death begins anew, and continues to all eternity. The means of escaping from this endless *Sansara* can never be found by observing the Vedic injunctions, which only lead men to temporary good fortune. The knowledge of non-duality and Brahman and the individual soul, as taught by the great saying, 'That art thou,' enables a man to find an escape from this miserable cycle of migration."

The true and full meaning of this severely concise exposition will not readily be caught without some such illumination as is furnished by Professor Bhattacharya. Even when caught, it may not commend itself to the Western reader, notwithstanding the approbation of such representative men as Schopenhauer, Max Müller, Cousin, and Schlegel, not to mention others. Given certain postulates, and the sailing is plain enough. But after all, most of such postulates are just the things that require demonstration to critical minds. The Vedanta philosophy, like many another, seems to begin at the wrong end. Professor Bhattacharya says it is "a combination of reason and revelation." "Though we see that the Vedanta philosophy is founded on the Vedic Upanishads, and though it is controlled by them in its method of inquiry—that is to say, though Adwaitism is a philosophical religion directly deduced from the Upanishads, and not from independent observation and analysis alone, as other systems of philosophy are, we are not to understand that it stands entirely severed from reason, experience, observation, and common sense. For it emphatically and clearly declares that Sruti or revelation, not supported by reason and not corroborated by experience and common sense, is not valid, and is not conducive to right knowledge." Has Professor Bhattacharya seriously applied his doctrine to the system of Sankara? And has he been in a position to consider without bias the mutual operations of revelation and reason in a society where religion has dominated the minds of men within the limits of a recorded time?

Professor Bhattacharya defends the ethics of the Vedanta. Undoubtedly, the theory, as Sir Monier Williams has pointed out, if pushed to its ultimate consequences, "must lead to the neglect of all duties, religious and moral, of all activity, physical and intellectual, and of all self-culture." Sir Monier will not be placed among the "careless thinkers" or the "thoughtless readers and interested sectarians" against whom Professor Bhattacharya does battle, in many points successfully. If "your neighbour is yourself, and you are to love him, not because he is your neighbour, but because he is not different from yourself," as Professor Bhattacharya interprets the teaching of the Vedanta, it certainly seems that there is no room for morality at all. But practice hardly ascends to the very rarefied summits of theory, and the Vedantist no doubt leads a good life on the lower slopes, "in accordance with strict moral laws, on account of his long-acquired habits of morality which have become natural to him," although such morality may not, directly and solely, be the fruit of his transcendental principles. Notwithstanding the labours of the renowned Sanharacharya and other scholars, the true meaning of the Vedanta "remains to the understanding of the people at large extremely obscure and abstruse." But it may be taken for certain that no interpretation that involves its ethical unsoundness can possibly be in accordance with the spirit from which the doctrines originated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

AUGUST, 1895.

ARGOSY. "Ahalya Baee: An Indian Queen."

ASIATIC QUARTERLY. Leitner, Dr. G. W., "The Future of Chitral and Neighbouring Countries."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). Candy, R. E., "All is Well that Ends Well: A Story of Hindu Domestic Life." Rogers, A., "The Princes of India and the British Government." "Education for Hindu Widows," by an Indian Social Reformer.

NINETEENTH CENTURY. Black, C. E. D., "Tibet as a New British Market."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

AUGUST, 1895.

GHOSH, PROF. A. S.........."What is Bimetallism? or, How to Restore England's Loss of £5,000,000,000." (Patrick Press, 28, Convent Road, Calcutta.").....................	0s. 2d.
HEWITT, J. F. (Late Commissioner of Chota Nagpur) ......"The Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times, in India, South-Western Asia, and Southern Europe." Vol. II. (Constable.)..	12s. 0d.
Supplement to the Year Book (1895) of the Imperial Institute. A Statistical Record of the resources and trade of the Colonial and Indian possessions of the British Empire. (John Murray.)................................	— —
GRACE, LIEUTENANT-COLONEL T., R.E.......Official Paper, "Administration Report on the Railways in India for 1894-5. Part I." (Simla Government Central Printing Office.)	— —

RECENT PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

283. EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT)—Return of the East India Financial Statement for 1895-96, and of the Proceedings theron in the Legislative Council of India.

299. EAST INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION)—Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1893-94. Thirtieth Number.

318. EAST INDIA (CANTONMENT ACTS)—Return of Copies of, or Extracts from, recent Correspondence between the India Office and the Government of India on the subject of the Cantonments Acts and Regulations.

336. EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN INDIA)—Return of, for the half-year ended on 31st March, 1895.

345. POST OFFICE (WEST INDIA MAIL CONTRACT)—Return of Contract entered into with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, and of Treasury Minute thereon.

[7772.] EAST INDIA: ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1895-96—Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India.

CELEBRATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF TULSIKRIT RAMAYAN. By Mr. F. S. GROWSE, M.A., C.I.E. Complete in 3 volumes. Fifth Edition. Highly spoken of both by English and Native Press. Also Second-hand books on sale. Price Rs. 3-6 by V.P. Post in India, and 4s. 6d. in England. Apply to Babu HARPRASAD, Municipal Commissioner, Fatehgarh, N.W.P., India.

TRADE MARK.
JVARA-HARI.
Is what its name implies, FEVER DESTROYER,
and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.
North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. WOOD, Captain 22nd North Staffs. Regt.
"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value-payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.
For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.
Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK
Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.
I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.
Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM CARPOOR" 8 ans., 1 Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent p
To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,
HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPA
43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C. AND 27, SECOND LINE BEACH, MADR

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), a
84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 10.
(NEW SERIES.)]

OCTOBER, 1895.

[SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID,
Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

PAGE.

INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus" .. 289
Chitral in the Commons 295
Lord G. Hamilton and Lancashire 296
OUR LONDON LETTER 298
Interview with Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji 300
British Indians in South Africa: Deputation to Mr. Chamberlain 301
THE RETENTION OF CHITRAL:
I.—Removing the Tall Poppies, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart., M.P. 305

PAGE

II.—A Retrospect and a Moral, by J. Dacosta .. 307
III.—Sir H. Fowler's Speech, by An Anglo-Indian 310
LORD G. HAMILTON'S BUDGET SPEECH, by H. Morgan-Browne, LL.B. 313
ROADS, RAILWAYS AND CANALS AND THE HEALTH OF INDIA, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A. 315
The Cost of Aggression 317
REVIEW: Prehistoric Races 318
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects.. 319

Indiana.

The debate on the Indian Budget, and the debate on Chitral which preceded it, took up two days of Parliamentary time in spite of the endeavours of the Government to curtail discussion. Even so, the discussion was all too brief and perfunctory. Every member of the House of Commons is, according to Sir Henry Fowler, a member for India. We wonder what British constituents would think of their representatives if they proposed to limit discussion upon the British Budget and the Estimates to two days at the end of a Session, when the House is listless and nearly empty. The debates on the Indian Budget, however, made up in importance what they lacked in completeness. There were three leading topics in the discussion—the retention of Chitral, the finances of India, and the import duties on cotton goods. These matters are dealt with at some length elsewhere. I may note here one or two smaller points which may easily escape notice in a long Parliamentary report.

The motion for going into Committee on the Indian t—the motion, that is, "that Mr. Speaker do ave the Chair"—was submitted on September rd, whereupon Sir Henry Fowler rose to call n to the decision recently arrived at by the ent as to the occupation of Chitral. It will mbered that, on August 19th, Sir W. rn endeavoured to move an amendment to the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne in these terms:—

> "And we humbly pray that your Majesty will be pleased to direct your Majesty's Ministers to give effect to the instructions issued in June last to the Viceroy of India in Council to withdraw from Chitral at the earliest possible moment consistent with safety and dignity."

When the time came for Sir W. Wedderburn to speak to this amendment Mr. Balfour urged him to postpone it on the ground, *inter alia*, that Sir Henry Fowler had left the House. The result of the discussion which followed was that (under circumstances described in last month's INDIA) Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment was closured before it was moved. For this result Sir Henry Fowler was, in no small degree, responsible. There was no possible excuse for his conduct. But if any excuse had been possible, it would have been that he himself intended at a later stage to submit an amendment and take the opinion of the House on the same subject. Such an opportunity arose on September 3rd, and how did he make use of it? He did, indeed, deliver a speech of great length. But he did not move an amendment, and did not press his opinions to a division. The *Manchester Guardian* probably expressed the feelings, I do not say of all persons interested in the welfare of India, but of all good Liberals, when it wrote of Sir H. Fowler's timidity: "We do not profess to understand so spiritless a proceeding." Nor was Sir H. Fowler's proceeding merely spiritless. Having called attention to the Chitral question, and failed to conclude with a resolution, he made it impossible for any other member, more courageous than himself, to take the opinion of the House on the same matter. The gratitude, therefore, that is due to Sir H. Fowler for a speech which was in many ways admirable must be tempered with the reflection that on two occasions he prevented the House of Commons from delivering in the division lobbies a verdict upon the policy of the "forward" school. He would have better consulted his dignity—yes, and his prospects as a Liberal leader—if he had been less anxious to display his reluctance to be associated with the Indian Parliamentary Committee and the Indian National Congress.

Sir H. Fowler having fired his blank cartridge and retired, Mr. J. M. Maclean, who is not unknown in India, took the field with an amendment condemning the "forward" policy in general terms:—

> "That this House views with apprehension the continual increase in the burdens of Indian taxpayers caused by the annexation or military occupation of large areas of unproductive territory on the land frontier of British India."

The peculiar advantages of this amendment, from Mr. Maclean's point of view, were twofold. It enabled him, as an expert in Indian affairs, to condemn the "forward" policy in general while, as a loyal supporter of the present Government, he excused the retention of Chitral in particular. His speech has, in this sense, been fairly described as a ridiculous attempt to run with the hare and to hunt with the hounds. The other advantage of the amendment from the Conservative point of view was that a division upon it would prevent a division upon the question of the import duties—a question upon which Lord George Hamilton and his colleagues have to steer delicately between the Scylla of injustice to India and the Charybdis of infidelity to Lancashire. Yet Mr. Maclean was hardly more courageous than Sir Henry Fowler. Having moved his amendment, he took fright and refused to "tell" in the division. Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree, who seconded Mr. Maclean's amendment, was afflicted with similar nervousness. Hence it was that the "tellers" for those who voted in favour of Mr. Maclean's amendment were none other than Sir W. Wedderburn and Mr. Henry J. Wilson. Mr. Maclean and Mr. Bhownaggree went so far as to vote for their own amendment, while Sir Henry Fowler, with feelings which may perhaps be better imagined than described, voted in the same lobby with supporters of the Indian National Congress. The other members who declared by their votes that they viewed with apprehension the increasing burden of military expenditure in India were Messrs. J. Brigg, J. Caldwell, R. K. Causton, F. Cawley, W. O. Clough, J. Colville, J. H. Dalziel, P. C. Doogan, T. E. Ellis, E. J. Griffiths, C. H. Hemphill, J. E. Jameson, D. B. Jones, W. Jones, J. H. Lewis, T. Lough, J. H. Maden, E. J. C. Morton, E. H. Pickersgill, R. J. Price, A. D. Provand, J. C. Rickett, J. B. Roberts, P. J. Stanhope, and D. Sullivan.

And who where the members who, by their votes on Mr. Maclean's amendment, declared that they viewed without apprehension the increasing burden of military expenditure? There were 137 of them, besides the "tellers," and they included the following 24 Lancashire members:—The Marquis of Lorne (South Manchester), Lords Balcarres (Chorley) and Stanley (Norwich), Sir G. Baden-Powell (Liverpool), Sir M. White-Ridley (Blackpool), Mr. A. J. Balfour (East Manchester), Mr. G. N. Curzon (Southport), Mr. Walter Long (Liverpool), Col. Blundell (Ince), Col. Foster (Lancaster), Col. Mellor (Radcliffe), Col. Sandys (Bootle), Messrs. R. Ascroft (Oldham), R. F. Cavendish (North Lancashire), O. L. Clare (Eccles), H. Shepherd Cross (Bolton), W. J. Galloway (S.W. Manchester), W. H. Hornby (Blackburn), G. Kemp (Heywood), J. Kenyon (Bury), C. M. Royds (Rochdale), W. E. M. Tomlinson (Preston), G. Whiteley (Rockport), and H. Whiteley (Ashton-under-Lyne). The curious thing is that no sooner had the division on Mr. Maclean's amendment been taken than some of these Lancashire representatives proceeded to bombard Lord George Hamilton with demands for the immediate repeal of the Indian cotton duties, and, if a division could have been taken on Mr. Philip Stanhope's amendment, it is not easy to see how any of them could have supported the import duties without annoying their constituents. But what have Lancashire electors to say to the conduct of these 24 members who, at one and the same time, denounce the cotton duties and declare that they view without apprehension the continual increase of the burden that caused the duties to be imposed and, unless it is relieved, promises to render them permanent? The people of Lancashire are commonly regarded as shrewd and hard-headed. Do they approve of the action of their representatives in applauding and therefore encouraging the cause of a diseased condition which they are pledged to remedy? Or what have the Lancashire Chambers of Commerce to say to what Sir A. Colvin has described as the perilous growth of Indian military expenditure?

Lord George Hamilton delivered his Budget speech on the following day, September 4th. It has commonly been thought that an amendment in respect of the Indian Budget could be moved only on the motion for going into committee, and that once in committee the Budget was unassailable. But this theory, as we foreshadowed in "Our London Letter" last month, received a shock during the recent debate. The formal resolution which was submitted to the House was as follows:—

> "That it appears, by the accounts laid before this House,

that the total revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1894, was Rx. 90,565,214; that the total expenditure in India and in England charged against the revenue was Rx. 92,112,212; that there was an excess of expenditure over revenue of Rx. 1,546,998; and that the capital outlay on railways and irrigation works was Rx. 3,621,252."

It is obviously no easy matter to move an amendment to so purely formal a resolution, which does not invite the House of Commons to take any particular steps or to express any particular opinion. The difficulty, however, was surmounted on the suggestion of an ingenious member—none other, I believe, than Mr. Arthur O'Connor—and Sir W. Wedderburn gave notice of an amendment expressing regret that, with reference to the net amount of public debt incurred, the accounts were inaccurate and misleading. Sir W. Wedderburn's original purpose was, I understand, to move that these words be substituted for the words of the official resolution. But upon learning from an authoritative quarter that such an amendment would have been out of order, he moved to add the words at the end of the question. The amendment, in this form, was accepted by Mr. Lowther, the chairman of committees. In the course of the subsequent debate it was withdrawn. But the fact that it was moved establishes an important precedent, and may well lead to substantial results on a future occasion. Hitherto the debate on the Indian Budget has been equally unreal in India and in the House of Commons, the result in each case being regarded as a foregone conclusion. It is another matter when an amendment is moved implying a motion of censure upon the Government of India, and, by the same token, upon the Secretary of State and the Ministry of which he is a member.

Lord George Hamilton, as will be seen from our Parliamentary Supplement, gave a remarkable answer on September 3rd, to Mr. E. J. C. Morton's question upon the "exchange compensation allowance." "The allowance," said the Secretary of State for India "is not given 'avowedly for expenditure in England' but to enable officers to meet such expenditure if they think fit." This is a new doctrine. The rupee is still a rupee in India. The exchange compensation allowance was ostensibly granted in the interest of non-domiciled British officials in India who suffered through the fall in exchange when they remitted money to Europe. If that was not the purpose of the allowance, why was it granted, why was it so called, and why was it not extended to Indians in the service of the Government of India?

A Bombay correspondent writes:—We learn that Lord Salisbury thinks the occupation of Chitral will not involve additional troops or expenditure. Nobody in India credits this anticipation. People here speak freely of additional military expenditure to the amount of 30 lakhs. This sum is considered by experts to be too small. We are accustomed to such sanguine estimates as Lord Salisbury's. At the threshold of every annexation the cost of maintaining the acquired territory is supposed to be next to nothing. It was so with the annexation of the Punjab and of Sind. It was so with Upper Burma, which was to have cost 15 to 20 lakhs. How egregiously this optimistic forecast was falsified within a year. The cost was over one and a-half crores. But Upper Burma is virgin land. What with the land revenue, salt excise, and mines, it is somewhat abating its annual expenditure which is now a few thousands under a crore. But Chitral is different. It is a barren region where even ordinary food and forage are scarce enough. It cannot be that retention of this inhospitable region will not entail additional expense. I am afraid that Lord Elgin is proving a failure. He appears to lack initiative. He is very timid and lacks either the will or the strength to act on his own responsibility in matters of grave import. He seems to be overawed by the masterful bureaucracy surrounding him. This condition of affairs, bad as it is, may become worse under a Tory *régime* in Downing Street, with Lord Salisbury at the Foreign Office, and Lord G. Hamilton as Secretary of State. The only corrective influence will be that of the Opposition in Parliament.

The following candidates are declared by the Civil Service Commissioners to have obtained the first sixty-six places in the recent Competitive Examination for the Indian Civil Service:—

	Total marks.
Marris, William Sinclair ...	3,738
Seton, Malcolm Cotter Cariston	2,843
Balfour, Charles Frederick...	2,630
Keith, William John ...	2,618
Butler, Montagu Sherard Dawes	2,548
Stow, Alexander Montague	2,375
Twang, Julius Mathison ...	2,354
Gracey, Stephen William ...	2,352
Smallwood, Arthur William	2,142
Rendall, Hugh Davey ...	2,125
Stowell, Vere Arthur ...	2,103
Pringle, John Christian ...	2,088
Jeffries, Francis Joseph ...	2,067
Wallace, Edward Hamilton	2,044
Clayton, Alfred Hare ...	2,041
Skinner, Stephen Stuart ...	2,001
Wilkinson, Charles Robert	1,983
Loxton, Charles William ...	1,977
Yewdall, Frank	1,953
Phelps, Edwin Ashby ...	1,948
Wilberforce, Samuel ...	1,936
Kilby, Reginald George ...	1,925
Stiffe, Norman Cecil	1,924
Vernède, Arthur Henry ...	1,899
Thornton, Hugh Aylmer ...	1,897
Marr, William Alexander...	1,891
Fergusson, John Carlyle ...	1,887
Stokes, Hopetoun Gabriel...	1,865
Vernon, Charles Venables...	1,881
Panton, Edward Brooks, Henderson	1,869
Braidwood, Harold Lithgow	1,868
Bird, Benwell Harold ...	1,864
Campbell, Archibald Young Gipps...	1,855
Boyd, Frederick Kennedy ...	1,852
Heycock, William Bissill ..	1,827
Johnston, Frederick William	1,823
Adie, Walter Sibbald ...	1,802
Brinton, Percival Robert ...	1,797
Clarke, Charles Agacy ...	1,788
Pratt, Henry Sheldon ...	1,778
Duval, Herbert Philip ...	1,777
Rossitor, Reginald Arthur ..	1,746
Campbell, William Edgar Marmaduke	1,736
Hammond, Egbert Laurie Lucas	1,729
Rose, Edward Ernest Pilkington	1 726
Smith, James Cowlishaw ...	1.718
Tupper, John Holman Eure	1,713
Moberly, Arthur Norman ..	1,707
Palmer, Charles Edgar .	1,693
Johnston, James Leonard ..	1,680
Monteath, George	1,660
Donald, James	1,657
Emalie, Harold Heather ...	1,635
Marten, John Thomas ...	1,607
Holland, Robert Erskine ...	1,598
Chotzner, Alfred James ...	1,596
Robinson, Frederick ...	1,587
Hall, Sidney Charles ...	1,583
Burton, Francis Hely ...	1,579
Humphries, Edgar de Montfort	1,567
Hemingway, Percy	1,554
Asghar-Ali, Sheikh	1.519
Graham, John Fuller ...	1,518
Leftwich, Charles Gerrans ..	1,508
Barniville, John Joseph ...	1,498
Rogers, Cecil Alfred Pelham	1,493

It would appear that only one of the successful candidates is an Indian. How would the numbers have stood if the so-called "open" examination had, in accordance with the resolution of the House of Commons, been held simultaneously in India and in London? The difference between the numbers of marks obtained by the first selected candidate and the last is glaring and instructive. It shows plainly that, under the present system, the Indian Civil Service is being recruited, in part, from men of distinctly second-rate capacity.

With reference to the Summary of Events of the administration of the Gondal State, which was noticed in these columns last month, a distinguished Anglo-Indian, who formerly held high office in the Government of India, writes to me: "The Thakor Saheb well deserves your favourable notice and, indeed, the condition of affairs in Gondal contrasts remarkably with our Indian administration, and very much emphasises Sir C. Dilke's contention (in which I most thoroughly agree) that what we need is decentralisation, each British district being administered like a Native State with special regard to the special needs of the locality. Here in Gondal we find leniency and consideration for the rayat, large sums spent in every direction for the good of the people, with plenty of cash on hand for useful public purposes affecting India generally. It is a most instructive contrast to our screwing, grudging, overweening Government, which is nevertheless not ashamed to boast and glorify itself. The whole thing fills me with shame. The action of the Thakor Saheb regarding opium is noticeable. It shows what the native opinion is as regards the use of opium, and is important as showing how much bolder and more effective a Native State can be in moral reform carrying with it local public opinion."

One of the most important matters which have lately occupied the attention of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress is the treatment meted out to British Indian subjects in South Africa. The Memorandum which is printed on another page sets forth in a compendious form the substance of petitions, memorials, and official correspondence dealing with the subject. It has already been noticed in these columns, and the details need not be repeated. But it may be said, briefly, that our Indian fellow subjects in South Africa, to the number, it is estimated, of some 100,000, and including merchants and hawkers as well as labourers and domestic servants, have to complain of a series of grave disabilities. Under four several Governments—those, namely, of Cape Colony, Natal, the South African Republic, and the Orange Free State—restrictions have been, or are being, imposed upon them which debar them from the possession of the franchise, the acquisition of real property, freedom of locomotion, the enjoyment of commercial licenses, and freedom of choice in respect of places of residence and places of business. "The Indian traders," as Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's Memorandum states "by their thrifty and simple mode of life have become strong competitors in trade with European settlers. This has aroused jealousy and bad feeling among the other colonists, who appear to be treating the Indians in a spirit of persecution and vexatious tyranny." The real motives for this persecution are, of course, concealed. The attempt, for example, to compel British Indians to live apart in special "locations" is based ostensibly on the ground that their mode of life is insanitary. Those who know anything at all about the Hindus and the Muhammadans of India know how grotesque this slander is. "The ablutions of the Hindu have," as the writer of "Indian Affairs" said recently in the *Times*, "passed into a proverb. His religion demands them, and the custom of ages has made them a prime necessity of his daily life." Add to this general statement the fact that three European Doctors in Pretoria and Johannesburg have certified, in the particular case under notice, that "it is impossible to object to the Indian on sanitary grounds," and it will be seen how flimsy is the pretext which commmercial jealousy puts forward.

A deputation, organised by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, waited upon Mr. Chamberlain at the Colonial Office on August 29th in order to lay the facts before him and to seek redress. The subject is, undoubtedly, complex and intricate, and it might have been well if the Memorandum which was placed before Mr. Chamberlain had been somewhat more precise. The chief grievances of which complaint is made are five in number, and four distinct and heterogeneous Governments are concerned. What, exactly, is the present position of British Indians in Cape Colony, in Natal, in the South African Republic, and in the Orange Free State respectively? Have all the obnoxious restrictions been already imposed in each case? And what, in each case, is the suggested mode of redress? These were preliminary questions, and they do not appear to have been answered fully and clearly by the deputation, who doubtless made the best use of the information at their disposal. Mr. Chamberlain in his reply, which was undoubtedly sympathetic and encouraging, attempted the task of differentiation, but apparently failed to cover the whole field. "So far as the principle is concerned, I do not suppose," Mr. Chamberlain said, "that there is any difference between us. We all desire that all British subjects should be treated alike, and should have equal rights and equal privileges."

So far, so good. It may be well to analyse the rest of Mr. Chamberlain's reply :—

> I. The Transvaal.—Here we are dealing with "a foreign and friendly Government." "The complaint is that certain subjects of Her Majesty are required to take up a separate residence." ("There is no question of the franchise in the Transvaal.") "I shall be most happy to make any representation upon the subject which I think is likely to have any influence, and from time to time to repeat those representations, in the hope that the Government of the Transvaal may find it to be unnecessary to continue a regulation which undoubtedly is calculated to cause pain." But "the award has been already accepted by Lord Ripon."
>
> II. Cape Colony.—Here we are dealing with "a self-governing colony." "The question is as to the exercise of the franchise." "The conditions of the franchise are so drawn that they do as a matter of fact operate more frequently to exclude Asiatics than to exclude persons of any other nationality." "It makes it very much more difficult to appeal against than if any class of Her Majesty's subjects were excluded under that name."
>
> III. Natal.—Here again we are dealing with "a self-governing colony." "The question is as to the exercise of the franchise." Moreover, "the proposed law in Natal does propose to exclude Asiatics *eo nomine*." But, "the law is not passed." On the contrary, "it is engaging my attention, and I trust that I may be able at a later period to make a satisfactory statement with regard to it."

What, then, is the positive element in Mr. Chamberlain's reply? It is threefold. With regard to the restriction of residence in the Transvaal, he promises to make and, if necessary, to repeat representations urging the Transvaal Government to remove it. With regard to the disfranchisement of Indians in Cape Colony, his words suggest that he will appeal against it, though he regards the task as difficult. With regard to the proposed disfranchisement of Indians, *eo nomine*, in Natal, he hints pretty plainly that he will disallow the proposal. To these three undertakings it may be added that Mr. Chamberlain addressed the deputation in these general terms: "Your claims and your requests have my most sympathetic consideration, and you may be sure that whatever influence I possess will be exercised in your favour."

We turn, however, to Mr. Chamberlain's omissions. The grievances of which British Indians in South Africa complain consist of restrictions upon (i) the acquisition of real property, (ii) the possession of the franchise, (iii) freedom of locomotion by day and night, (iv) the enjoyment of trade licenses, and (v) freedom of choice in respect of places of residence and places of business. Now, Mr. Chamberlain omitted all reference to the Orange Free State. With regard to the Transvaal, he omitted to refer to grievances (i), (iii) and (iv). With regard to Cape Colony, he omitted to refer to grievances (i), (iii), (iv) and (v). With regard to Natal, also, he omitted to refer to grievances (i), (iii), (iv) and (v). It is to be presumed that Mr. Chamberlain's attention will again be directed to these matters when Parliament re-assembles, if not before. Nor are his remarks upon the disfranchisement of British Indians in Cape Colony entirely satisfactory. It may be true that Asiatics are not disfranchised there *eo nomine*.. But has Mr. Chamberlain any doubt as to the real purpose of the restrictive qualification? The fundamental question was well summed up by the writer of the article, "Indian Affairs," in the *Times* of September 9th:

> "In India the British, the Hindu and the Mussulman communities find themselves face to face with the question as to whether at the outset of the new industrial movements which have been so long and anxiously awaited, Indian traders and workers are or are not to have the same *status* before the law as all other British subjects enjoy. May they or may they not go freely from one British possession to another, and claim the rights of British subjects in Allied States? Or are they to be treated as outcast races, subjected to a system of permits and passes when travelling on their ordinary business avocations and relegated, as the Transvaal Government would relegate them, to a *ghetto* at the permanent centres of their trade? These are questions which apply to all Indians who seek to better their fortunes outside the limits of the Indian Empire."

The tone of Mr. Chamberlain's reply to Mr. Naoroji's deputation shows how he would answer these questions. It remains for the Secretary for the Colonies to prove that "where there's a will, there's a way."

The question of the separate "locations" in the Transvaal calls for special notice. The Convention of Pretoria, 1881 (clause 14), and the Convention of London, 1884, between the British Government and the Government of the Transvaal, enforced the provision that British Indian subjects in the Transvaal should stand upon a footing of equality with other British subjects. Attempts were, however, afterwards made to modify this equitable provision. Law 3 of 1885 sought to amend clause 14 of the Convention of London, and to provide that British Indian subjects might be required to reside and to trade in separate "locations." The British Government refused assent to this amending law, but a subsequent attempt of the same kind was more successful. In 1886 the provisions of Law 3 of 1885 were carried in an amended form, Sir Hercules Robinson withdrawing, upon what were described to him as urgent sanitary grounds, the opposition which had previously been offered. The representations which were made to Sir H. Robinson may not have been fraudulent, but, as Mr. Bonnerjee pointed out to Mr. Chamberlain, they were certainly false. They are contradicted by the certificates of European doctors. Nor is that all. The amendment of 1886 created difficulties instead of removing them, and the differences between the British Government and the Government of the Transvaal were afterwards referred to the arbitration of the

Chief Justice of the Orange Free State. Mr. Chamberlain lays stress upon the difficulty and the danger of going behind an arbitrator's award. But the point is, that the decision of the Chief Justice was not an award in any proper sense of the term. He was "to decide either in favour of the claims put forward by Her Majesty's Government, or by the South African Republic, or to lay down such interpretation of the ordinances, read together with the despatches referring to the question, as shall appear to him to be correct." Three courses were open to him, but he appears to have taken none of them. On the contrary, he appears to have upheld the amendment of 1886, at the same time declaring it to be subject, in case of objections, "to sole and exclusive interpretation in the ordinary course of the tribunals of the country." Yet recourse had been had to arbitration precisely in order that such objections might be dealt with. There should be no great scruples about going behind an award of this remarkable nature.

Since Mr. Naoroji's deputation waited upon Mr. Chamberlain further memorials from Indians residing in Natal have reached us. They are addressed to the Viceroy of India and to Mr. Chamberlain, and they refer to the special question which is dealt with in the Indian Immigration Law Amendment Bill recently passed by the Natal Legislature. This precious measure deprives Indian labourers, who have gone to the colony under contract to work for a term of years, of the option of remaining in the colony, free from interference, on the expiry of the term. The latter alternative has, during the past few years, been chosen by many thousands of Indian labourers, who are now found to constitute a disturbing element in the labour market of South Africa. The new law, which Mr. Chamberlain is urged to disallow, would compel the Indian labourer either to return to India on the expiry of his term or to enter into new indentures—in other words, become a slave. Otherwise, he must "take out year by year a pass or licence to remain in the colony, to be issued by the magistrate of his district," at a yearly cost of £3 sterling—more than three months' pay for an indentured labourer. The proposal is a disgrace to its authors, and an insult to British subjects. To permit it to become law would be to legalise a monstrous wrong. "A man is brought here," as the Attorney-General for Natal has well said, "in theory with his own consent, in practice very often without his consent. He gives the best five years of his life, he forms new ties, forgets the old ones, perhaps establishes a home here, and he cannot, according to my view of right and wrong, be sent back. Better by far to stop the further introduction of Indians altogether than to take what work you can out of them and order them away. The colony, or part of the colony, seems to want Indians, but also wishes to avoid the consequence of Indian immigration." Mr. Chamberlain's course in dealing with the new measure is clear. He hinted, not vaguely, to Mr. Naoroji's deputation that he intended to disallow the Natal measure which expressly proposed to exclude British Indians from the franchise. There is surely no reason to suppose that he will show any more tenderness to the Indian Immigration Law Amendment Bill.

The *Times*, in a leading article published on August 30th, said that the deputation to Mr. Chamberlain "chiefly consisted of Parsi gentlemen living in London." Mr. Naoroji promptly corrected this absurd inaccuracy. He explained, in a letter which appeared in the *Times* of September 2nd, that the deputation consisted of four Hindus—Messrs. Bonnerjee, Haridas, Roy, and Nair; two Muhammadans—Messrs. Ghani and Meerza; and two Parsis—Mr. Bhownaggree M.P., and Mr. Naoroji himself. But why did the *Times* go out of its way to describe the deputation incorrectly?

It would be impossible to exaggerate the strength of the hostility which has been provoked among all sections and classes of the Indian people by the Pilgrim Ships Bill. Memorials to the Viceroy, articles in Indian and Anglo-Indian newspapers, and private letters from well-informed correspondents in India show what a burning question the proposals contained in this ill-starred measure have aroused. Nor can we be surprised at such a result. It is notorious that pilgrimage to the holy cities of Mecca and Medina is one of the articles of the Muhammadan faith. The measure against which such emphatic protest is now being made was framed in accordance with the decisions of a Convention held at Paris. It aims at sanitary reform, and starts from the assumption that Indian pilgrims are responsible for the outbreaks of cholera which occasionally occur in Europe. The grounds for this assumption are not forthcoming. But if they were as substantial as they are actually flimsy, they would not excuse such a measure as the Pilgrim Ships Bill. It is a compact of faults. It was drafted at the dictation of a Convention in which India was not adequately represented. It is diametrically opposed not only to public opinion but also to expert medical opinion in India. It seeks to prevent disease, but it does not grapple with the real cause of such disease as exists—namely, the negligence of the Turkish authorities. It imposes a tax which is so high as to be prohibitive in the case of all the poorer pilgrims, and it compels the Government of India to collect this odious impost from Muhammadans on behalf of Turkey. It makes demands in respect of space and air on the pilgrim ships which are so sublime as to be ridiculous. It imposes vexatious regulations as to quarantine which, in the opinion of competent judges, would do more harm than good. The requirements of public health undoubtedly justify heavy demands upon the resources and the convenience of private individuals. But the evil which this measure purports to remove is not shown to exist, and it is shown that, if it did exist, this measure would not remove it. The Bill will have to be delayed or submitted to drastic revision. Meantime, although it affects immediately only one religious community in India, the general hostility that it has provoked shows how all the religious communities are really bound together by common sympathies. The Hindu willingly lends aid to his Muhammadan fellow-countryman just as the Muhammadan would doubtless lend aid to the Hindu if occasion arose.

FIDUS.

CHITRAL IN THE COMMONS.

THE discussion on the future of Chitral, which preceded the introduction of the Indian Budget, proved to be of a singularly futile character. In the circumstances it would have been unduly sanguine to expect any better result. The big battalions were there, in comparative strength at least, to impress the utter formality of debate. Sir Henry Fowler blazed away for a couple of hours, but it was practically with blank cartridge, for his speech was in effect a defence and a protest rather than an attack. Lord George Hamilton picked up a few of Sir Henry's points by way of official courtesy, toyed with them, and thought they were mistaken. He was fluent in assertion, and confident in hopefulness. The solid grounds for either attitude were not made apparent. The evil day of reckoning was staved off. Meantime something may turn up. If the wrong thing turn up, there will be no lack of official explanation that the wit of man could not have obviated the mischance. It is not that either the present or the late Indian Secretary fails in theoretical interest in the fortunes of India. What one seems to miss in their acts and utterances is the imagination that realises. It may be that it is the official system that confines and benumbs them. In any case, this Chitral business might have been made to wear a very different aspect if Sir Henry Fowler had kept the country promptly informed as to the facts and the tendencies of the Liberal policy, and if Lord George Hamilton had consequently been made to feel that the subject was really worthy of serious treatment. The influence of English party conflict is painfully obvious, and what is worst of all is that the interests of India fall through between her professed well-wishers and champions.

Why is it that Lord George Hamilton has reversed Sir Henry Fowler's policy of evacuation of Chitral? For one thing, he places reliance on the judgment of the Indian Government, and rates his predecessor for not giving due heed to advice from Calcutta. But, to all intents and purposes, the judgment of the Indian Government may be taken to be the wishes of the military party. In these columns, the preponderance of technical opinion upon the strategic value of Chitral has already been fully demonstrated. Take away Lord Roberts, and there is hardly a single name left in support of this forward policy, and Lord Roberts himself is a pervert. It would be difficult to say whether it is less nonsensical to minimise the value of the opinion of Sir Donald Stewart, for example, on the ground, forsooth, that he has not been in India for some years back, or to excuse the suppression of his views on the ground that their publication would necessitate the publication also of the views of Sir George White and Sir Henry Brackenbury, which again would involve exposing "to the whole world an elaborate analysis "of the strong and weak parts of our military "system." As if, indeed, such an analysis were of necessity included in the opinion! As if, indeed, it would matter practically two straws whether such an analysis were published or not! But the excuses are not serious, and do not deserve to be considered seriously. In any case, it is quite evident that the Indian Government cannot have before its mind any essential factor in the situation which officers like Sir Donald Stewart cannot have before their mind with equal vividness. There is no virtue whatever in saying ditto to the Indian Government in such a position of affairs. The judgment of the Home Government, indeed, is much more likely to be clear and unbiassed, and it is bound to be exercised with firm independence.

But, says Lord George Hamilton, what would be the result if we should evacuate Chitral? In the first place, Gilghit "would in all probability have "to be abandoned." Well, but where is the probability? We held Gilghit before we took hold of Chitral; why, in the light of all the circumstances, could we not go on holding it as before? It cannot be implied that the Chitralis would swarm over the hills and drive us away, or exterminate our Agency. Again, would it be so very serious a loss to India if we did abandon Gilghit? Gilghit is a very expensive luxury. It is even less accessible than Chitral will be by the new road. It is quite a recent establishment. Really, it is difficult to imagine why Gilghit should be so precious in the eyes of the Indian Secretary. But to make an assumed probability of the abandonment of Gilghit a reason for the military occupation of Chitral is a stroke of argument worthy of permanent record. In the second place, if we evacuated Chitral, "we should "have lighted a fire there which would be limited "only by the extent over which it spread." That is the way with all fires; it is not a peculiarity of Chitral fires. But there is danger in metaphors. What does Lord George Hamilton mean by "a fire"? We are surprised at his moderation; he might have called the thing a conflagration. Well, if we retired, no doubt there would be the traditional course of "dynastic murder and civil "war." But, then, what in the world does it matter to India? The dynastic murder is not an event that calls for more than passing notice from anybody. The civil war, notwithstanding the meaning of which the words are capable, implies nothing more than a fight or two between opposing handfuls of tribesmen. Look back on the history of Chitral; there is no record of India's being one whit the worse for all the "dynastic murder" and "civil war" that Chitral has witnessed—until we went into the thick of the fray and made a fuss over the native practice. But, further, says Lord George, each of the Powers, England and Russia, is bound to do its utmost to prevent anarchy, disorder, and disturbance, within its borders. How is it possible to keep a grave face over the suggestion that the faction fights of rival cut-throats are likely to disturb the peace of the neighbouring protégés of Russia? If our people would only keep within their own boundaries, Chitral would never be heard of, whatever its disturbances. But, once more, according to Lord George, "the mere fact of "our retiring before the face of the whole world, "and admitting that we were unable to perform "the duties we had practically undertaken, would "have been an invitation to the neighbouring "Power to step in and perform the duties we had "abandoned." It is not worth while to quarrel with the assumptions of Lord George's phraseology. But if our Pamirs boundary agreement with Russia be a thing of any pith and moment, it is hard to see how Russia could justify an entrance upon our neglected duties in Chitral. Would it not be a vastly simpler matter to send the fleet to the Baltic and the Black Sea in case of real need, than to pother about in this ridiculous, and ridiculously expensive, fashion in the barren mountains of the North-West? "I think," says Lord George, "that "the considerations of a moral rather than of a "strategic character force us to remain." The assertion fitly caps the rest.

On the other hand, what are the results likely to come from our remaining in Chitral? Here there at once leaps forward a consideration of a moral character that might have been expected to command a little more respect than it has received. The Viceroy's Proclamation unquestionably conveyed the impression that we should retire. But for that promise, the opposition of the intermediate tribes would certainly have been persistent and determined. Now, however, Lord George tells us that the independent mountaineers are charmed with our invasion, and would break their hearts if we should leave their country. Who is so hopelessly childish as to believe any such thing? By the judicious distribution of *douceurs* it is easy enough to get up an appearance of satisfaction in a limited circle of bribees; but that is the full extent of the alleged newborn love of these tribesmen for the society of the Anglo-Indian. The whole thing is, as Sir Henry Fowler properly characterised it, a gross breach of faith; and while, on the face of the Proclamation, we could have retired without the loss of an atom of prestige, there can be no doubt whatever that our breach of faith will grievously damage our real prestige in its most vital part, throughout the whole of India. Lord George Hamilton may quibble over the point to a heedless and party-bound House of Commons, but it is an uncommonly ostrich-like proceeding in view of the leaders of Indian opinion. The cost of occupation—for men, for cantonments, for the road, for bribes, for further developments—will, to a certainty, far exceed any estimate that has yet been adventured, and might in ordinary decency have commanded some reasonable discussion. Lord George, it is true, professes his anxiety about the expenditure. "Constantly increasing taxation," he says, "is a serious danger to the stability of the Govern- "ment." But he has nothing to set against this awful danger, except vague aspirations for a golden age of "quietude and economy." Such an age would indeed be a surprising development in Indian administration. In the light of past history, the aspiration of the Indian Secretary is beyond criticism; it can only be regarded with respectful amazement. Such amazement is only deepened by a study of Lord George Hamilton's exposition of the Indian Budget. But on the financial side of the question there needs no further debate in the columns in INDIA. We can only hope that some lucky accident may at length awaken the people of England to the extreme danger that now threatens India between the rampant spirit of militarism and the rottenness of the whole financial system. The debates in connexion with the Budget in the fag-end of the present session go far to justify the gloomiest fears of those who believe that Englishmen will never take the affairs of India seriously in hand except on the compulsion of a catastrophe.

LORD G. HAMILTON AND LANCASHIRE.

CYNICAL politicians, if any politicians are cynical, must have found material for a grim kind of amusement in the contrast between Lord George Hamilton's utterances on the subject of the cotton duties before and after the General Election. Everybody remembers the exciting incident of February 21st last, when Sir Henry James, at that time member for Bury, but now a peer and a member of Lord Salisbury's Cabinet, moved the adjournment of the House of Commons in order to call attention to the effect of the reimposition of the cotton duties. Sir H. James's motion, contrary to expectations which were entertained earlier in the day, was defeated, but it served a useful purpose for the Conservative party. It did not bring about the immediate overthrow of Lord Rosebery's Administration, but the debate and the division upon it contributed greatly to the defeat of the Liberals at the subsequent General Election. The motion was rejected by 195 votes. But of the Conservative members who were present in the House when the division was taken, 101 voted against the cotton duties, and only 51 for them. A five-lined whip had been issued to Conservative members, and among those who voted with Sir Henry James were the Conservative whips and the eldest son of Lord Salisbury. That was not all, nor nearly all. Before the division was taken Lord George Hamilton delivered a speech which, if it had been deliberately prepared as an electioneering manifesto for Conservative candidates in Lancashire, could not have served the purpose more perfectly. "The views," said Lord George, "which I myself "held twenty years ago as to the impolicy of im-"posing cotton duties upon English goods, I hold "still, and the distinguished chief under whom I "then had the honour of serving, Lord Salisbury, "held those views, and also holds them still." Lord George Hamilton, who appears to mistake reiteration for emphasis, repeated the substance of this declaration a score of times before he sat down. He stated the reasons for which Lord Salisbury and he had formed opinions hostile to the cotton duties. They held that the tax was unfair to Lancashire, and dangerous to the stability of British rule in India. He declared that if one wanted to hear the real voice of India he must not go to Bombay or Calcutta where Western ideas had introduced Western methods of agitation. "I know," he asserted solemnly, "the gentlemen who get up "these agitations." Lord George Hamilton protested strongly against a measure which must, he said, result in the erection of a hostile barrier against the importation of cotton goods into India. He "disbelieved altogether" in the efficiency of a countervailing excise-duty. He demanded that the Government of India should "pay some attention to "the wishes and wants of English electors," asserting that India, unlike a self-governing colony, lived on the material support which it derived from England. In his closing words he announced that he would vote with Sir H. James "as a protest against "the unwisdom and unfairness of putting the whole "burden of saving the solvency of the Indian "Government on the shoulders of one already very "distressed industry."

Lord George Hamilton's speech had in Lancashire the effect which might have been expected, and when its author was appointed to be Secretary of State for India in Lord Salisbury's Government, only one thing further was required to confirm Lancashire electors in the belief that the Conservatives would repeal the cotton duties. That was an assurance that Lord George Hamilton retained in office the opinions which he had expressed as a member of the Opposition. The assurance was forthcoming from Lord G. Hamilton himself. Writing to "a "leading Conservative" in the Accrington division of Lancashire, in response to an invitation to speak in the constituency, the Secretary of State for India said: "I am tied here, and working day and night "until this contest is over, so I cannot come to "Accrington. My views on the extra duties are "stated in a speech of mine I made this spring in "in the House of Commons, and my appointment to "India ought in consequence to help in your elec-"tion." This letter supplied the last link in the chain, and it is no exaggeration to say that in the Lancashire constituencies the Conservative candidates made all possible capital out of the circumstance that, while Sir Henry Fowler had sanctioned the cotton duties, Lord George Hamilton had denounced them. We have referred previously to the election addresses issued by the Conservative candidates in Oldham, Preston, Burnley, Bury, and the Heywood division of Lancashire. Where a candidate refrained from mentioning the cotton duties in his address, the subject received adequate attention at his meetings. The result was an overwhelming victory for the Conservatives. But now comes the mysterious sequel. No sooner had the new Government met Parliament, strong in a majority of 152, than Lord George Hamilton performed a feat of tergiversation which is, we imagine, second to none in the whole history of politics. He not only departed from the language which he had previously used, and emphasised by repetition, but he so completely reversed it that on September 4th, at the close of the debate on the Indian Budget, Mr. Balfour was able to say that he could not make out that Sir Henry Fowler differed in any important particular from Lord George Hamilton. If Mr. Balfour had said that, or anything like that, before the pollings took place, the representation of Lancashire in the House of Commons would be different from what it is. We need not attempt to characterise Lord George Hamilton's conduct. Apparently he does not think that he has changed his mind or contradicted himself. "I adhere," he said in reply to Mr. Stanhope on August 26th, "to the speech I "made on February 21st, and have nothing to "retract in connexion with it." In other words, he still holds that the reimposition of the cotton duties was unwise, impolitic, and unfair, and that the countervailing excise duty is useless. Yet in his reply to Mr. Stanhope he added: "I certainly "ought not to be expected to give any opinion on "the question until the Indian Government have "had an opportunity of fully stating their views." Needless to say, the Government of India had already stated its views as fully as Lord George Hamilton had stated his own.

The indignation of Lancashire electors at this piece of tergiversation is natural enough, whatever opinion may be entertained as to the reasonableness of the Lancashire demand. That demand is that the cotton duties should either be removed, or neutralised by "a complete and effectual excise-"duty on the whole of the production of the Indian "mills." The present agitation in Lancashire has had one admirable result. It has excited an unprecedented degree of interest in the underlying problems of Indian finance. Lancashire electors are coming to perceive that extravagant military expenditure in India is not only bad for India, but is bad also for Lancashire. "It is," the *Manchester Guardian* wrote the other day, "the unceasing and "enormous demands for larger and ever larger "expenditure in pursuance of a military policy "which the best and coolest heads believe to be "radically mistaken which is at the root of our "present trouble, and will, if it is allowed to pre-"vail, be the fruitful source of many more." Similarly we find Mr. F. Cawley, the newly elected member for the Prestwich division of Lancashire, declaring to his constituents on September 7th that "what the Liberals have got to do as a party is to "insist that this continual military expenditure "should be kept down. Then they would be able "to cut their coat according to their cloth, and they "would be able to remove the duties." There is good reason to believe that this type of argument is becoming common on Liberal platforms. If so, India will gain and Lancashire will gain too. It cannot be too often insisted that the United Kingdom would reap enormous advantage if an economical policy were pursued in India. Prosperity would then take the place of poverty among the Indian people, and the market for British goods would be proportionately improved. This belief is undoubtedly gaining ground in Lancashire. But it will have to make a good deal of headway yet before the aggressive military schemes of the Government of India are seriously checked by public opinion in the United Kingdom. Many Lancashire Conservatives, for example, voted against Mr. Maclean's amendment on September 3rd, and thereby certified that they viewed without apprehension the continual increase in the burdens of Indian taxpayers caused by annexation or military occupation. Mr. James Kenyon, the member for Bury, and Mr. George Kemp, the member for the Heywood division, voted against Mr. Maclean's amendment. Yet both of these gentlemen denounced the cotton duties in their election addresses, and on September 4th, Mr. James Kenyon, in a speech not devoid of a certain rough vigour, protested against them in the House of Commons. One would like to know whether the constituents of these inconsistent members have invited them to reconcile their speeches with their votes. One thing, at any rate, is certain. Now, if ever, the Indian reform party has an excellent opportunity of enlisting the active sympathies of Lancashire electors on the side of a policy of retrenchment in India.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has been pleased to approve of the appointment of Colonel the Right Honourable Sir Joseph West Ridgeway, K.C.B., K.C.S.I., as Governor of Ceylon in the Room of Sir Arthur Elibank Havelock, G.C.M.G., appointed to be Governor of Madras.

Sir Joseph West Ridgeway is the son of a Tunbridge Wells clergyman, and was born in 1844. He entered the Bengal army in 1861, and was attached to the 25th Bengal Native Infantry and the 3rd Goorkhas. In 1869 he was appointed by Lord Mayo to the political service. He served in the Afghan War, and was twice mentioned in despatches, and soon afterwards was made Under-Secretary to the Government of India (Foreign Department). In 1884-5 he was in charge of the Afghan Frontier-Commission. On his return to India he was appointed to succeed the late Sir Robert Hamilton as Under-Secretary at Dublin Castle. He never attempted to win the sympathy of the people. When Mr. Morley became Chief Secretary, it was felt that a change of officials was desirable and in 1893 Sir West Ridgeway was sent on a special mission to Morocco. He has since had an interval of rest as Governor of the Isle of Man. Lady Ridgeway, whom he married in 1881, is a daughter of Mr. R. C. Bewicke, of Coulby Manor, Yorkshire.

The London Indian Society held its second annual dinner on September 4th at the Holborn Restaurant, under the presidency of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. About fifty covers were laid. Amongst those present were Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee and Professor A. F. Murison. Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. A. Webb, Mr. Hume, Mr. Caine, Mr. Seymour Keay, and other friends of India were unavoidably absent. On his entry into the reception room Mr. Naoroji was enthusiastically welcomed.

The chairman read a telegram from the Liberals of Central Finsbury expressing regret at the recent defeat of Mr. Naoroji and hoping that an early opportunity would occur to secure his return to Parliament. A reply thanking them for their kind wishes was forwarded. Professor Murison proposed the toast of India, regretting the defeat of Mr. Naoroji, and condemning the "forward" military policy and the annexation of Chitral. In acknowledging this toast, Mr. Bonnerjee declared that if the present policy continued it would not be long before the ordinary territorial limits of India were eliminated and the Government became bankrupt. Mr. H. N. Heridas followed. Mr. M. A. Ghani proposed the toast of the Indian National Congress and the British Committee, and Mr. Martin Wood and Mr. H. Morgan-Browne replied. The other speakers included Mr. Gopal Singh, Mr. J. Oldfield, Mr. C. Menon, Mr. C. H. Vora, Mr. K. A. Ghaswalla, Mr. J. Meerza, Mr. D. U. Parekh, Mr. H. N. Khairaj, and Mr. J. V. Desai.

It is impossible within our limits of space to do justice to the "opinions of the press" upon the recent discussions of Indian affairs in the House of Commons. On the whole they are highly disappointing. The decision of Lord Rosebery's Government to withdraw from Chitral and the contrary decision of Lord Salisbury's Government ranged the two political parties, and their organs, in opposition to each other in respect of the "forward" policy, and while the *Daily News* and the *Speaker* and other Liberal newspapers praised Sir Henry Fowler, the *Standard* and the *Times* and other Conservative newspapers praised Lord George Hamilton. There was less division on the subject of the import duties, though some Conservative critics in Lancashire protested very mildly against Lord G. Hamilton's breach of faith. As for the underlying problems of Indian finance, there was, as usual, very little attempt on either side to come to terms with them.

Referring to Lord George Hamilton's hopes for "a period of quietude and economy" in India, the *Daily Chronicle* asked:—"What hope is there of quietude? Ever since the inauguration of the new Forward Policy—that is to say, during the past eighteen years—we have almost constantly been on the war-path along the Indian frontier. What hope can there be of economy? Is it not written, even in an official return, that the military expenditure of India during that period has been no less a sum than Rx.30,611,109? That calculation, it is to be remembered, does not include the Waziri Expedition, nor yet the Chitral Expedition. Whether the Chitral Expedition is to cost £13,000 or £130,000 in Lord George Hamilton's estimate is a matter of moonshine. It may not eventually cost twenty times that estimate, on the expansive model of the Afghanistan Expedition, but everybody knows that £130,000 is an estimate *pour rire*. Further, the admitted sum of Rx.30,611,109 does not include the remarkable item of Rx.11,032,781, which during the eight years ending 1892-93 was spent on expeditions and warlike preparations, though it was not considered worthy of exhibition under separate headings in the ordinary accounts. Here, then, we have an average expenditure on war in India at the rate of at least two millions a year, and it would take a hardy statistician to deny that the whole amount for the eighteen years equals, if it does not materially exceed, the whole cost of the military operations for putting down the Mutiny of 1857!"

There were, however, at least two notable exceptions to this rule. The *Daily Chronicle*, though hardly with its former fulness, and the *Manchester Guardian*, probed more deeply into the problems of Indian financial embarrassments. "The great farce of the political year," wrote the *Daily Chronicle* on September 4th—"or is it not, rather, the gloomiest tragedy of the season?—occupied the boards at Westminster last night. We are so inured to the spectacle of the discussion of the affairs of our great Eastern Dependency in an odd evening at the fag-end of the Session, and in a sparse and listless House, that it requires some effort to realise the fatuity of the proceeding. Our legislators do not scruple to devote weeks and weeks to debate over questions that appear to be more important only because they lie nearer to our sight and feeling—and especially to our political contentiousness. Yet here is the administration of India—a question that all those who have got through the alphabet of the matter regard with the deepest concern, not unmixed with dread, a question in comparison with which Sir William Wilson Hunter himself has publicly declared that even Home Rule is but a bagatelle—the administration of India, in whose weal or woe the very foundations of our Imperial power are seriously, not to say essentially, involved, is passed upon in a single hurried debate, in a thin, wearied, and impatient House, and in the common knowledge that the result is a foregone and empty conclusion."

A series of admirable articles appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* at the end of August and the beginning of September. Indian readers who wish to see sympathetic English opinion at its best would do well to secure copies of the *Guardian* for August 29th and 30th and September 4th. Discussing on the last-named day the financial embarrassment of India, the *Guardian* wrote: "There are, of course, not wanting those who see in the removal, by one means or another, of the anomaly that India has no money in common with that of the rest of the empire the only final solution of the difficulty. But meanwhile there are others, and notably the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, of which Sir W. Wedderburn is the Chairman, who hold that, as the Indian Government has for years had the exchange difficulty facing it at every turn and likely each year to increase the drain on its exchequer, it ought above all things to have 'cut its coat according to its cloth.' It is not denied that a certain amount of increased expenditure by the Government of India has been 'not only necessary but desirable in the interests of good government, and even legitimate under all the circumstances.' But it is urged that the civil and military expenditure and the gold liabilities have been increased at an extravagant rate not justified by any consideration of prudence, and that so long as the burdens on the Indian Exchequer are added to or are likely to be added to by falling exchange even the plea that fresh expenditure is 'eminently useful and desirable' should be rigorously disregarded if the expenditure is not of supreme necessity."

"And," continued the *Manchester Guardian*, "it is the plain fact that whereas the expenditure on civil and military services alone has increased by Rx. 5,429,034 during the past seven years, irrespective of an increase of Rx. 4,195,628 due to loss by exchange in the payments of these departments, in other departments, such as the debt, commercial and special services, there have been decreased expenditure and increased profits amounting to Rx. 5,715,802, which have more than counterbalanced a loss by exchange on these accounts amounting to Rx. 3,309,692. It is plain, therefore, that the loss by exchange is not the main cause of the present financial difficulties of India, but that if the Military Budget stood to-day where it stood seven years ago, there would have been no deficit to provide for and no need for the imposition of new taxes. It is the unceasing and enormous demands for larger and ever larger expenditure in pursuance of a military policy which the best and coolest heads believe to be radically mistaken which is at the root of our present trouble, and will, if it is allowed to prevail, be the fruitful source of many more."

Mr. A. Wylie, M.P., has given notice of the following motion for the next Session of Parliament: "That this House whilst sympathising with Her Majesty's Government in their financial difficulty in India, has noted with regret the reimposition of Import Duties which were abolished with such acknowledged advantage in 1882, and is of opinion that the amount of revenue derived from them is small compared with the cost, direct and indirect, of collection and the annoyance and obstruction necessarily caused to trade, and that this House is also of opinion that the countervailing Excise Cotton Duties have not removed the element of protection, and therefore craves Her Majesty's Government to take steps as soon as possible for entirely repealing those Duties."

Mr. B. L. Cohen, M.P., informs us that he does not regard Lord G. Hamilton's answer as conclusive on the subject (discussed in the debate on the Indian Budget) of Imperial Guarantee for Indian Debt. Mr. Cohen intends "to pursue the motion further with a view, if possible, to surmount some objections to his proposal which were not mentioned by Lord G. Hamilton, but which Mr. Cohen is aware do apply to it."

Sir Henry Fowler's daughter, Miss Ellen T.

Fowler, has written another volume of poetry, which Messrs. Cassell will publish this autumn, under the title, "Verses, Wise and Otherwise." Her first book of poems, "Verses, Grave and Gay," appeared some time ago.

INTERVIEW WITH MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

If for no other reason than that the ex-M.P. for Central Finsbury was the first native of India who represented a British constituency in Parliament, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji would (writes a representative of *Great Thoughts*) be entitled to an honourable place in the roll of Indian statesmen. But this is only one, and the least, of his claims to distinction. No Indian subject of Her Majesty has laboured with such constant assiduity for the advancement of his country's interests as this greatest of Indian patriots.

"Tell me," said I, at a recent interview, "how far your efforts have been successful in throwing open the Indian Civil Service to natives?"

"On June 3rd, 1893," was the reply, "the House of Commons passed a resolution agreeing to the holding of simultaneous examinations for all the Civil Services in India and England. Now it was the duty of the Government to give effect to that resolution, but from the first the Secretary of State for India set his face against it. Therefore, instead of carrying it out, the English Government asked the opinion of the Indian Legislature, who were well known to be always averse to it. In regard to English affairs, if a resolution is passed relating to any department of the public service, the Government are bound to give effect to it. They would never think of first consulting that particular department. But, unfortunately, in Indian matters the Indian authorities invariably ignore or resist any resolution or Act which tends to benefit the native population. They do all they can to render it a dead letter. This has been their policy ever since 1833, when the first Act was passed 'to treat Englishmen and Indians in His Majesty's Service on the same footing, without regard to race, colour, or creed'."

"Do you mean to say," I asked in astonishment, "that the terms of this Act have not been faithfully observed?"

"They have been a dead letter up to the present day," said my host. "The violation of the pledges made to India time after time has been scandalous."

"How do you account for it? Do you not think that the English Government is sincerely anxious for the social welfare of India?"

"The Government may be anxious to promote India's welfare," said Mr. Naoroji, "but, unfortunately, its action is simply a reflex of the India Office. We are suffering severely from the transference of Indian rule from the East India Company to the Crown. We are worse off now than before, because in the days of the old East India Company we could appeal to Parliament against any unjust act of the Company. But now the Government feels that it ought to uphold the Secretary of State for India, whoever he may be, and he is usually a man without adequate knowledge of Indian affairs, who plays into the hands of the Indian Council; while the Council itself is out of touch with the native public opinion of the day. The Indian side of a question is, therefore, seldom understood by the Government. Under these circumstances, even a Liberal Government becomes anti-Indian or Anglo-Indian, which is the same thing."

Mr. Naoroji went on to charge the Home Government with violating their pledge to allow one-sixth of the appointments of the Covenanted Civil Service to be given every year in India. For six or seven years, he said they ignored the Act altogether, and then framed rules nullifying the Act of Parliament, and even tried to bring discredit on the home-chosen portion of the Service by selecting indifferent men; "and what is still worse," continued Mr. Naoroji with rising indignation, "the Secretary of State for India of his own free will, and without the slightest reference to the House of Commons, has abolished this wrongly-styled 'statutory service' of 1870."

"And what do you think must be the ultimate result of such a policy?" I asked.

"I prophesy," said Mr. Naoroji, earnestly and deliberately, "that this constant violation of pledges, this persistent opposition to Indian interests, and the deterioration and impoverishment of the country by an evil administration, must lead, sooner or later, to a rebellion. I hope I may prove a false prophet, but in the interests of the British Empire I say that forces are gathering, vast and powerful, which will succeed in shattering the British Indian Empire, if the present evil and destructive system of administration be not thoroughly reformed. The pity of it is that the British people and Parliament are genuinely desirous of promoting the interests of India and constituting it an integral part of the British Empire, but the Indian authorities disobey their desires and stultify their wishes."

"Why should they do so? What interest have they in so acting?"

"Simply in order to reserve to themselves the sweets of power and pay, or, as one eminent Anglo-Indian expressed it, 'in order to provide for our boys.' The usual plausible excuse is that they think that the larger the number of Europeans in the service the safer India is. But this is a complete mistake, and will prove their chief Nemesis and retribution. Let us consider first the European civil service and population. They are scattered over a vast empire, and would be the immediate victims of any rebellion. The last mutiny furnished us with an object lesson in this respect. But the Indian authorities won't learn by experience. Many a European owed his safety to the loyalty of the natives by whom he was surrounded. Then there are the military services. In such a contingency the civilians could not even depend on the native army for protection, because there is the possibility that the native army would side with their kith and kin. As for the European army, their duty would be divided between opposing the native army, putting down the rebellion, and helping the Europeans—an impossibility. Lord Roberts has himself admitted that even were the army much larger than it is at present, and even were it perfection itself, the safety of British rule would nevertheless depend entirely on the satisfaction of the people.

"There is one further element of danger," continued Mr. Naoroji. "Suppose that while some such trouble as this was brewing, Russia, which is on the other side of the hedge, were to seize her opportunity to strike a blow at England. What would be easier? Indeed, the Indian authorities are doing everything in their power to tempt Russia to invade India, both by their policy of dissatisfying the Indian people with their rule, and by making an easy road for Russia through the mountains of Afghanistan at our expense. Depend upon it, the 'Forward' policy is a suicidal one. By penetrating to Afghanistan, we only bring ourselves the nearer to Russia, and Russia nearer to ourselves."

"What then do you consider would be a wise policy to pursue with regard to India?"

"To satisfy her with the justice of British rule, to be honest and honourable in all our solemn pledges, and thus to make Indians feel that to fight for the British rule is to fight for their own hearths and homes and property. With Indian subjects of such a temper you could defy half-a-dozen Russias. Another most important point, which is not understood in England, is this: that the effect of a large European service is to impoverish the Indian people both financially and intellectually. For not only do retired servants carry their pensions and savings clean out of the country, but the country is drained of its wisdom and experience. We have no elders left to guide us. A third point is that we should keep within India proper. The river Indus and the mountains of Afghanistan are our natural protection against all enemies. It is as if Nature herself had planted them there for that very purpose of protecting our Empire. Last, but not least, every expenditure of every kind is thrown upon India, while Britain does not contribute a farthing to it in return for the vast benefits she derives from connection with that country. Do you think that the Indians are not keenly alive to this degradation, this 'slavery,' as Macaulay very justly called it? To me it is well nigh inexplicable how British statesmen can continue so blind to the common-sense dictates of righteousness, so untrue to their own honourable character, and so unyielding to the demands of civilisation."

BRITISH INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

DEPUTATION TO MR. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, received at the Colonial Office on August 29th a representative deputation of Indian gentlemen, now resident in London, who desired to lay before the Government certain grievances of British Indian subjects in Africa. The right hon. gentleman was accompanied by the Hon. T. H. Cochrane, M.P., Mr. E. Fairfield, C.B., and Mr. H. F. Wilson (private secretary). The deputation, organised by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, consisted of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree, M.P., Mr. Hardeoram N. Haridas, Mr. Parbati C. Roy, Mr. T. M. Nair, Mr. M. A. Ghani, and Mr. J. Meerza.

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, introducing the deputation, said that from the memorial sent to Mr. Chamberlain it would be seen that there were over 100,000 British Indian subjects residing in South Africa—that was, in Cape Colony, Natal, the Transvaal, etc. The Indian traders had become strong competitors in the trade with European settlers, and a determined effort had been made to lower the status of British Indian subjects. It was being attempted to impose restrictions which would prevent British Indians acquiring real property, the possession of the franchise, freedom of locomotion both by day and night, the granting of trade licences, and freedom of choice as regarded places of residence and business. They asked that Indian British subjects should have extended to them the protection to which every British subject was entitled, and which was exemplified in the case of the recent outrages in China and Armenia. Lord Ripon had assured them that it was "the desire of Her Majesty's Government that the Queen's Indian subjects should be treated on a footing of equality with all Her Majesty's subjects," and it was upon that basis that they asked that these Indian subjects in South Africa should be treated. The principal ground that had been urged by the South African authorities for imposing those restrictions was the unsanitary mode of life of these Asiatics. On this subject the *Times* of the 24th June said: "It is needless to say that the Indian Hindus and Mussulmans stand out as examples of bodily cleanliness among Asiatic races, and, we may add, among the races of the world. The ablutions of the Hindu have passed into a proverb. His religion demands them, and the custom of ages has made them a prime necessity of his daily life. As regards their religion teaching them to consider all women as soulless and Christians as natural prey, the Indian memorial indignantly remarks: 'Your petitioners ask, Can there be a grosser libel on the great faiths prevailing in India, or a greater insult to the Indian nation?'" Then the writer in the *Times* went on to say: "The whole question resolves itself into this: Are Her Majesty's Indian subjects to be treated as a degraded and outcast race by a friendly Government, or are they to have the same rights and status as other British subjects enjoy? Are leading Muhammadan merchants, who might sit in the Legislative Council at Bombay, to be liable to indignities and outrage in the South African Republic? We are continually telling our Indian subjects that the economic future of their country depends on their ability to spread themselves out and to develop their foreign trade. What answer can our Indian Government give them if it fails to secure to them the same protection abroad which is secured to the subjects of every other dependency of the Crown?" The *Times of India* also denounced the oppression of British Indian subjects in South Africa.

Mr. Chamberlain: I would like you, or some other member of the deputation, to put a little more practically what are the exact measures which you think that we can and ought to take.

Mr. Naoroji replied that the Convention of 1881 put Indian British subjects on the same footing as other British subjects, and what they wanted was to have the amendments that were carried out in 1884-5-6 done away with or repealed.

Mr. Chamberlain: Yes, but you are speaking as though the Convention were an Act of Parliament which we had passed, and which, therefore, we could repeal or alter. It is really a treaty which has been signed by two parties, and it cannot be altered without the consent of both.

Mr. Naoroji: And we do not want to alter the Convention of 1881. We want them to be put in the position which the Convention gave them.

Mr. Chamberlain: I am speaking of the subsequent arrangement, which was equally an arrangement by treaty. I am not arguing on the merits of the alteration, but I want you to address yourself to the fact that that was a convention or agreement between two friendly Powers—the Republic of the Transvaal on the one hand, and the British Government on the other. Having agreed to that, we cannot alter it, *mero motu*, by our own efforts, unless the Republic of the Transvaal will consent to alter it too. We can make friendly appeals to that Government to vary the treaty, but if they refuse we cannot undertake that they shall be forced to do it—that would mean an act of war.

Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee said that the amendment was agreed to by Sir Hercules Robinson on a representation by the Transvaal Government of circumstances which did not exist.

Mr. Chamberlain: Is it your contention that the assent of the British Government was obtained under false pretences?

Mr. Bonnerjee said he would not go so far as that, for no doubt the President of the Republic believed what had been represented to him as to the alleged unsanitary condition of British Indian subjects in the Transvaal.

Mr. Chamberlain: Even assuming all that to be true, it does not give us ground for insisting that the Acts shall be repealed. I could quote a case in which a dispute arose between two Powers as to a boundary, and an agreement was come to upon the presentation of a map which has been subsequently proved to be false. But the agreement was made, and it was impossible to go back upon it.

Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee said that the present was a different case. According to the Convention of London, as he understood it, no law affecting British subjects in the Transvaal would be binding on them, unless the British representative gave his sanction to it. Sir Hercules Robinson refused his sanction to the Act of 1885, and it was amended in 1886, and his sanction to the Act as amended was obtained on the representation that the health of the Republic depended upon it. It was subsequently discovered that this representation was not in accordance with the facts, and correspondence took place between the two Governments, with the ultimate result that the matter was referred to arbitration. The point referred, however, was not decided by the arbitrator, and the controversy now remained where it was before the reference. The practical remedy the Indians in South Africa desired was that the case should be remitted back to the arbitrator for his decision on the point at issue, and failing his doing so, that steps should be taken to obtain the repeal of the Act of 1885 as amended.

Mr. Chamberlain: In the paper you have handed to me, you ask that we should go behind that arbitration. That is destructive of the principle of arbitration, of which I know some of you are very strong advocates. Whatever doubt I might have had myself upon the subject would have been entirely removed by the decision of my predecessor. Lord Ripon, who, as you say, was most sympathetic, as I am myself, with what you wish to do, found it impossible to go behind the arbitration, and has instructed the High Commissioner to inform President Kruger that Her Majesty's Government are prepared to accept the award of the arbitrator in respect to the Indian traders.

Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee said that that was not known to them when preparing the paper, but it was not easy to understand how an award which did not decide the point at issue came to be accepted by Lord Ripon. He hoped that the British officials would keep their eyes open, so that his fellow-countrymen should not be reduced to the class of Kaffirs, for the Republican authorities had been trying to bring them down to that level.

Mr. Bhownaggree, M.P., said that his countrymen had four other grievances in South Africa, namely, that the acquisition by them of real property had been made a difficulty, if not entirely denied; that the franchise, although not directly denied, had been made almost impossible of attainment; that they had no freedom of locomotion both by day and by night; and that trade licences were granted to them in a different way from that in which they were granted to Europeans. For information as to these grievances he had been obliged to rely upon his friend Mr. Naoroji, but they struck him as real grievances under which no British subject ought to be allowed to suffer. He hoped that Mr. Chamberlain would not consider these grievances were more fanciful than real.

Mr. Naoroji said these grievances did not exist in the Transvaal only, but existed in Natal and Cape Colony, especially as regarded the franchise. The grievances they had stated were only typical, and representative of grievances that spread over the whole of South Africa.

Mr. Chamberlain, in reply, said: The matter which you have brought before me is one of very great importance, and one which has already engaged my careful attention. I have taken the care to make myself acquainted with all the points in the case, and with the decisions which have been come to in regard to it by my predecessor. So far as the principle is concerned, I do not suppose there is any difference whatever between us. We all desire that all British subjects should be treated alike, and should have equal rights and equal privileges. Let me say in passing that one member of the deputation made a comparison which, I think, was rather invidious, for he said he was anxious that his fellow-countrymen should not be treated like Kaffirs; but I may point out to him that Kaffirs also have an equal claim, for they also are British subjects, and are entitled as British subjects to the same rights as every other nationality in that capacity. I should not be inclined to say, as Mr. Bhownaggree has suggested, that your grievances in this respect were fanciful or imaginative. I think that they are real grievances, and that they have not the less importance because they are sentimental and moral rather than material. But I must also protest against any kind of exaggeration. When Mr. Naoroji goes on to compare the grievances under which our Asiatic fellow-subjects are suffering in South Africa with the outrages upon British subjects in China or upon Armenians in one of the provinces of Turkey, that surely is to mix up two totally different things. You are not complaining of personal and bodily outrage, which would undoubtedly be resented if it were suffered by you in any country of the world, but you are complaining that certain rights and privileges, partly social and partly political, have been wrongfully withheld from you. The difficulty that I have is in finding a practical way of dealing with the question. I am very desirous to meet your wishes, but it is evident to me that my predecessor was unable to find any way of meeting them satisfactorily or immediately, and I also was hopeful that you would give me suggestions which I had not been able to find for myself. We are dealing with two classes of Governments—in the first place with a foreign and friendly Government, and in the second place with self-governing colonies. Over neither of these have we sufficient influence to deal of our own motion, and by our own authority, with questions of this kind. We could, as I have said, deal at once with anything in the nature of a personal outrage, but when all that we have to say is that some privilege has been withheld, it is a matter no doubt for the exercise of influence, but it is not a subject that we can settle by our own intervention and without much friendly negotiation. The complaint in the Transvaal is that certain subjects of Her Majesty, as I understand, are required to take up a separate residence. There is no question of the franchise in the Transvaal, because the Government of the Transvaal refuse that privilege quite as much to Englishmen and to other subjects of Her Majesty as they do to Asiatics. It is not a special denial which applies only to our Asiatic fellow-subjects, but it applies equally to all who are not already burghers. The complaint made is as to this separation, which is thought to cast a stigma. I shall be most happy to make any representation upon the subject which I think is likely to have any influence, and from time to time to repeat those representations, in the hope that the Government of the Transvaal may find it to be unnecessary to continue a regulation which undoubtedly is calculated to cause pain. But I have already pointed out to you that I have no absolute power. It is nothing more than the exercise of this kind of influence that I can promise you; because the award has been already accepted by Lord Ripon. Then as regards the self-governing colonies, the question is as to the exercise of the franchise. I understand that in no case has any refusal of this privilege been established against Asiatics as such. There is no mention of any particular class of Her Majesty's subjects in any form of exclusion. The only grievance, therefore—if there is a grievance—is that the conditions of the franchise are so drawn that they do as a matter of fact operate more frequently to exclude Asiatics than to exclude persons of any other nationality. That may be the case, but it makes it very much more difficult to appeal against than if any class of Her Majesty's subjects were excluded under that name. That is not the case; it is only accidentally and incidentally that Asiatics have been excluded, if they have been excluded, from the franchise.

Mr. Bhownaggree: You are speaking of the qualification to sign?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes. The condition of the franchise is that the person claiming it shall be able to sign his name in English, and it is said that that does, as a matter of fact, exclude a considerable number of Asiatics. That may be the case, but, as I say, it is not an exclusion directed against Asiatics, but it is directed against persons who are unacquainted with the English language.

Mr. NAOROJI: In Natal it is actually directed against Asiatics.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes; but there, permit me to say, the law is not passed. The proposed law in Natal does, as Mr. Naoroji has pointed out, propose to exclude Asiatics *eo nomine*. I think that is undoubtedly a provision which requires the most serious consideration. It is now engaging my attention, and I trust that I may be able at a later period to make a satisfactory statement with regard to it. I think, therefore, it will be seen—and I hope the deputation will accept that as really being the extent to which I can go to-day—that your claims and your requests have my most sympathetic consideration, and that while I am bound to point out to you that I am not so powerful as I think you imagine I am, yet you may be sure that whatever influence I do possess will be exercised in your favour.

Mr. BONNERJEE explained that the Kaffirs he had referred to were the Kaffirs who were subjects of the Transvaal Republic, and not those who were British subjects.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: We have fellow-subjects who are Kaffirs in the Transvaal.

Mr. NAOROJI, in thanking Mr. Chamberlain for the very sympathetic and considerate manner in which he had received them, said that he had not intended to exaggerate their grievances by his reference to China and Armenia, his object being simply to point out the principle upon which the British Government acted in regard to the protection of British subjects. He hoped that such influence as the Government could exercise would be used to improve the conditions of British Indian subjects in South Africa, and that in the colonies, where Her Majesty had the right of vetoing any Act, nothing would be sanctioned which would make a difference between British Indian subjects and British subjects of other complexions.

The deputation then withdrew.

The following Memorandum, signed by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and dated August 28th, was supplied to Mr. Chamberlain before the deputation waited upon him:—

1. There are over 100,000 British Indian subjects residing in South Africa, *i.e.*, in Cape Colony, Natal, the South African Republic (Transvaal), and the Orange Free State. These may be roughly divided into four main classes as follows:—

(1) Merchants.
(2) Hawkers.
(3) Domestic servants.
(4) Labourers, *i.e.*, indentured coolies whose indentures have expired.

In the Transvaal alone there are 200 merchants (with liquidated assets valued at £100,000), about 2,000 hawkers, and 1,500 domestic servants.

2. The Indian traders by their thrifty and simple mode of life have become strong competitors in trade with European settlers. This has aroused jealousy and bad feeling among the other colonists, who appear to be treating the Indians in a spirit of persecution and vexatious tyranny; and more especially by means of their preponderating voice in the several South African States, to be making a determined effort to lower the *status* of those British subjects who happen to be natives of British India.

3. The following are some of the matters in which it is attempted to impose restrictions upon British Indians, by the several Governments of Cape Colony, Natal, the South African Republic (Transvaal), and the Orange Free State:—

(1) The acquisition of Real Property.
(2) The possession of the Franchise.
(3) Freedom of locomotion both by day and night.
(4) The granting of Trade licenses (which are necessary for all engaged in trade).
(5) Freedom of choice as regards places of residence and places of business.

Early in this year the Cape Assembly passed a Bill authorising the East London Municipality to legislate with a view to compel British Indians to reside in locations and to take out passes should they want to leave their homes after 9 p.m. Generally, an attempt is being made to treat all Indians, whatever their caste and position, as "coolies," *i.e.*, labourers (generally assisted emigrants whose indentures have expired); and further, to class all "coolies" with Kaffirs and other native races, however uncivilised.

4. Trade jealousy is at the root of this hostile treatment, but other pleas are put forward, namely, that the Indians are uncivilised barbarians, and more particularly that their insanitary mode of life is a standing menace to the health of the community. On this latter point, however, the evidence appears to be all the other way. *Vide post*, para. 9.

5. The most urgent matter is perhaps the attempt which is being made to compel the Indians to confine themselves both for purposes of residence and of trade to certain fixed "locations," necessarily inconvenient for trade, as being away from the actual town, and possibly dangerous to health, as being in a situation for which no one has any particular use except it may be the deposit of town refuse. [Such a case actually occurred in 1893, and elicited a strong protest from the British Agent against the action of the Transvaal Government. *Vide* Green Book No. II. of 1893.] Such an unreasonable restriction on liberty can at the best mean nothing less than financial ruin to a merchant.

6. What appears to have taken place in the Transvaal is this. The Convention of Pretoria, 1881, clause 14, and the Convention of London, 1884, between the South African Republic and Great Britain, alike provide that equal treatment in the eye of the law shall be received by all persons residing in the Republic save and except natives of the place. These Conventions did not confer any *status* on the Indians or any other British subjects. They merely safeguarded that "footing of equality with all Her Majesty's other subjects" upon which successive Secretaries of State for the Colonies have desired that the Queen's Indian subjects should be treated.

7. Clause 14 of the Convention was amended by Law 3 of 1885 in the direction of allowing British Indian subjects to be required to reside and trade in separate "locations." But to this Law Her Majesty's Government refused assent, stating most emphatically in the course of the correspondence on the subject that separate streets might be set apart for the Indians in the interests of the public health, but that they could not be compelled to trade in certain fixed parts only of the towns.

8. In 1886 an amended form of Law 3 of 1885 was passed, and the then High Commissioner, Sir

H. Robinson, in withdrawing his opposition thereto, made it clear that even in its amended form this departure from the Convention was only permitted on 'what had been represented to him as urgent sanitary grounds. In his letter dated 26th September, 1886, at p. 46 of Green Book No. 1 of 1894, he says, "Although the amended law is still a contravention of the 14th Article of London, I shall not advise Her Majesty's Government to offer further opposition to it in view of your Honour's opinion that it is necessary for the protection of the public health." It is to be regretted that Sir H. Robinson did not take steps to ascertain for himself whether or not the state of things in existence at the time justified the opinion of the Head of the Republic as expressed to him.

9. The assumption that any sanitary necessity exists for this curtailment of the liberties of British Indian subjects appears to be singularly ill-founded. The following three certificates from European doctors resident in Pretoria and Johannesburg speak for themselves:—

"I hereby certify that I have practised as a general medical practitioner in the town of Pretoria for the last five years.

"During that period I have had a considerable practice amongst the Indians, especially about three years ago, when they were more numerous than at present.

"I have generally found them cleanly in their persons, and free from the personal diseases due to dirt or careless habits. Their dwellings are generally clean, and sanitation is willingly attended to by them. Class considered, I should be of opinion that the lowest class Indian compares most favourably with the lowest class white, *i.e.*, the lowest class Indian lives better and in better habitation, and with more regard to sanitary measures, than the lowest class white.

"I have, further, found that during the period that smallpox was epidemic in the town and district, and is still epidemic in the district, that although every nation nearly had one or more of its members at some time in the lazaretto, there was not a single Indian attacked.

"Generally, in my opinion, it is impossible to object to the Indian on sanitary grounds, provided always the inspection of the sanitary authorities is made as strictly and regularly for the Indian as for the white.

"H. PRIOR VEALE, B.A., M.B., B.C. Cantab.

"Pretoria, Z.A.R., 27th April, 1895."

"Johannesburg, 1895.

"This is to certify that I have examined the residences of the bearers of this note, and that they are in a sanitary and hygienic condition, and in fact such as any European might inhabit. I have resided in India, I can certify that their habitations here in the Z.A.R. are far superior to those of their native country.

"C. P. SPINK, M.R.C.S. and L.R.C.P. (Lond.)."

"Having frequently occasion to visit the better class of the Indian population of Johannesburg (merchants, etc., coming from Bombay) in my professional quality, I give as my opinion that they are as clean in their habits and domestic life as white people of the same standing.

"DR. NAHMMACHER, M.D., etc.

"Johannesburg, 14th March, 1895."

10. Here, however, the matter was not allowed to rest. Difficulties again arose on the subject of the British Indian subjects, and further correspondence took place between the British Government and the Republic, the result of which was that some time ago the differences between the two Governments were referred to the arbitration of the Chief Justice of the Orange Free State to whom power was given "to decide either in favour of the claims put forward by Her Majesty's Government or by the South African Republic, *or to lay down such interpretation of the ordinances, read together with the despatches referring to the question, as shall appear to him to be correct.*"

11. The Chief Justice has made his award, but if the text of it as given in a petition to the Secretary of State for the Colonies from the British Indian subjects residing in the South African Republic is correct then certainly he has not decided the principal question referred to him. He was required to lay down such interpretation of the ordinances as should appear to *him* to be correct. He has not done so. He refers to law 3 of 1885, and its amendment in 1886, and says that the Republic is bound and entitled to give full force and effect to this law subject in case of objections "to sole and exclusive interpretation in the ordinary course of the tribunals of the country." The law and the tribunals of the country were in existence before the reference to the arbitrator, and both the disputants were well aware of the fact. What they wanted was the Chief Justice's interpretation of the law read with the dispatches, and not the interpretation of the law by the tribunals of the country. He has not given it to them, and there can be no doubt but that the award apart altogether from its unsatisfactory character, is not binding on either party, and the controversy remains where it was when the reference was made to the Chief Justice.

12. So far the British Government would seem to have acted in the interests of their Indian subjects, but hitherto their action has not borne fruit, and the grievances remain unredressed. The first step towards this end is the repeal of the unconstitutional amendments to clause 14 of the Convention of London.

13. From information which has come to this country it is clear that an attempt is being made to disfranchise British Indian subjects throughout South Africa by means of new legislation imposing conditions which are a practical bar to Indians retaining or obtaining the Franchise. As regards Cape Colony, it appears that an Act, namely, Act 9 of 1892, was passed by the Colonial Parliament, and promulgated on August 16th, 1892. The Indians objected to it as being in effect a disfranchisement Act so far as they were concerned, and they petitioned the Crown to withhold its assent from it; the reasons on which the petition is based are contained in a letter sent by the Indians to the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated October 24, 1892. As regards Natal also, a disfrancishing Act was passed in 1894. The Indians protested and, failing in the Colony, sent a petition to the Secretary of State for the Colonies praying that the Act might be disallowed by Her Majesty. There is reason to believe that this petition has not yet been disposed of by the Colonial Office.

14. The matters above dealt with are of extreme gravity. They touch directly the well-being of British Indian subjects in South Africa, and indirectly the rights and privileges of such subjects emigrating to other parts of Her Majesty's dominions. It is hoped that they will receive earnest and sympathetic consideration on the part of the authorities at home, and such steps taken as will ensure to the British Indian subject the privileges which he enjoyed before the measures complained of were taken in hand.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1895.

THE RETENTION OF CHITRAL.

REMOVING THE TALL POPPIES.

By SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

Twenty years ago, when we first came into political relations with Chitral, a tough old Chief, Aman-ul-Mulk, was the ruler of that territory. He probably did not possess all the cardinal virtues; but he possessed those particular qualifications which we most required in a frontier neighbour; he was strong enough to keep order; he was fairly popular with the local tribes; and he was well disposed towards the British Government. Indeed his friendly disposition towards us was of a pronounced and practical kind. For in 1876 he voluntarily tendered his allegiance to our feudatory the Máháraja of Kashmir, and afterwards proposed still closer relations with the Indian Government. He was in fact prepared heartily to throw in his lot with us. What condition of frontier affairs could be better than this? And what was the secret of this fierce old barbarian's attachment to our rule? The reason was a simple one. His ruling passion was, and the ruling passion of all these tribes is, love of independence; and that independence was threatened from the side of Afghanistan. Hence his affection for us. The motive was self-preservation, a motive which governs human nature all the world over. I remember long ago a rebellious little mite being put into the corner until she should promise amendment. To the surprise of all she immediately reported, "Alice is good." But the mystery was cleared up when hastily retreating from the corner, she added *sotto voce* "Alice is very much afraid of that big spider!" In the present case the Amír of Kabul was the big spider, whose threatening attitude produced such good inclinations among the frontier tribes. Aman-ul-Mulk thought we might help him to maintain his independence, and that we did not covet his territory. Hence he drew towards us, and became our willing ally. To use the words of the Government of India in their despatch of the 8th of May last, "fear of Afghan aggression threw Mehtar Aman-ul-Mulk into the arms of Kashmir, and thus led to British suzerainty."

This Aman-ul-Mulk was not one of those helpless puppets set up by ourselves, who get their throats cut the moment we are in difficulties. Of such puppets, to our sorrow, we have had large experience, from Shah Shujah in the first Afghan War down to Nizam-ul-Mulk in the present complications. No; Aman-ul-Mulk was a ruler able and willing to bring help to his friends in time of need. And this he did effectually for us, a short time afterwards, when we got ourselves into trouble with the tribes at Gilghit. In the Gilghit direction we had followed the "forward" policy, which means encroachment upon the tribes. Instead of, as at Chitral, supporting the tribes against outside aggression, we had ourselves become the trespassers upon their independence; and in pursuance of this policy had established a frontier post at Gilghit, an isolated position far away among the most inaccessible ranges of the Hindu Kush, some 250 miles from Chitral, and more than that distance from the British frontier. Here, unmindful of the tragic fate of Sir Alexander Burnes, and of Sir Louis Cavagnari, we had located Major Biddulph, as our agent, with a small escort of native troops. Thus isolated he was at the mercy of the wild frontier tribes, being cut off by the snows, even from Kashmir, during six months of the year. From this precious coign of vantage Major Biddulph was supposed to keep watch and ward over the safety of the Empire; but in point of fact he was not in a position to secure even his own safety. Being viewed with jealousy and distrust by the tribes whose independence he was invading, he was without sources of information, and quite in the dark as to what was going on around him. The result was that just as winter was setting in, and the passes were closed, a bolt fell upon him out of the blue. Quite unexpectedly the tribes were raised against him by the Chief of Yasin, a supposed friend and ally, and but for the intervention of Aman-ul-Mulk, he would undoubtedly have been destroyed before help could reach him. The following is the guarded official account of our narrow escape on this occasion (*vide* Government of India Despatch of 22nd December, 1880, printed at page 4 of the Chitral Blue Book): "On the 29th October, a force of 750 men, led by Pehlwan Bahadur, the Chief of Yasin, surprised the frontier fort of Gakuch, and marched upon Gilghit. The Kashmir fort at Sher was invested and attacked, and Major Biddulph was informed that more than one of the neighbouring Chiefs only awaited its fall to join the insurgents. He advanced to its relief with his own escort of 20 native infantry and some Kashmir troops, but the attempt failed, and for a time there was a prospect of his being himself beseiged. On the 19th November, however, we received news that Pehlwan Bahadur had broken up the investment of Sher and withdrawn; and it appears from later intelligence that, attacked or threatened in the rear by the Chitral Chief, he had been abandoned by his men, and had fled almost alone towards Wakhan. The rising has therefore for the present completely collapsed, and there is reason to hope that no further disturbances may take place. The causes and objects of the rising are still obscure." Of course they were obscure, as regards particulars. For all purposes of local information poor Major Biddulph was up in a balloon. But as regards the general cause and object of the rising there could be no doubt. The cause was hatred of intruders, and the object was to get rid of them. Political officers may say what they like, but that is the root of the whole matter. And this truth was shortly afterwards admitted by the Government of India which, having temporarily returned to sanity under the guidance of Lord Ripon and Lord Hartington, withdrew the irritating presence of the Gilghit outpost. Then there was peace on the frontier. When the thorn in the flesh was removed the inflammation disappeared.

This Yasin incident, with the opportune arrival of Aman-ul-Mulk as a *Deus ex machinâ*, illustrates vividly the wisdom of Lord Lawrence's policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of frontier States, whether large or small. Far the most important act of internal self-government in these tribal States is the choice of their ruler, and Lord Lawrence's policy was to leave this matter to the people themselves. When, by the rough and ready methods customary in such primitive communities, the survival of the fittest has been secured, then is the time for the Government of India to recognise him as the *de facto* ruler, not for his personal merits, nor on account of any supposed partiality for ourselves, but because he represents the people of the State, and because he has shown himself capable of maintaining order among them. According to this policy our one abiding interest in our relations with these frontier States is that the ruler should be a strong and responsible man; strong in his personal character, and strong in his influence over the tribes. And whatever his original feeling may have been, we may reckon with confidence on his drawing towards us and becoming, like Aman-ul-Mulk, an effective supporter, if we can only convince him that we have no designs against his independence. Dost Muhammad, a really strong ruler, was an instance in point. Though we treated him as an enemy in the first Afghan War, and drove him from Kabul, in order to set up our puppet Shah Shujah, he nevertheless became our staunch ally when, having regained his throne, he became satisfied that we had given up our insane idea of occupying Afghanistan.

What Dost Muhammad was on a large scale, Aman-ul-Mulk was on a small one. And if our Indian Government had been wise they would, on his death, have allowed the process of natural selection to provide Chitral with a successor of similar qualifications. While the delicate operation of selecting the fittest is going on, outside interference is purely mischievous. Our political officers, being as a rule in the hands of intriguing subordinates, are generally ignorant of the real character and disposition of the various claimants, and their attempts at king-making would seem farcical if the results were not so disastrous and humiliating. What were the events which followed on the death of Aman-ul-Mulk in August 1892? First, one of his sons named Afzul-ul-Mulk violently seized upon the reins of government, setting aside his eldest brother, Nizam-ul-Mulk, who was his father's acknowledged heir. This Afzul-ul-Mulk next proceeded to put to death three of his remaining brothers, and then wrote to the Viceroy announcing his succession, which he described as having taken place "with the unanimous consent" of his brothers. This was grim irony, worthy of Philip of Spain. But it will hardly be credited that the Viceroy, Lord Lansdowne, being aware of the above facts, at once wrote in reply to this blood-stained usurper, and actually congratulated him on his accession with the consent of his brothers (*vide* Blue Book, p. 18). This uncouth attempt to worship the rising sun proved abortive. For a month had hardly elapsed before the one strong man in the Chitral imbroglio appeared on the scene. This was Sher Afzul, brother of Aman-ul-Mulk, who had for some time been a refugee in Afghanistan. As usual the political officers were quite taken by surprise. They were just contemplating a British mission to Chitral, "in order to consolidate our relations" with the usurper, when Sher Afzul entered Chitral territory with a small party of horsemen. He was joined by large numbers of adherents, and immediately marched upon Chitral fort, which he took, killing Afzul-ul-Mulk. As he was a capable and popular man the people at once submitted to him, and there seemed some prospect of a settled government in Chitral. But these arrangements did not commend themselves to Colonel Durand the British agent at Gilghit, who, without the sanction of Government, proceeded to take part in an expedition against Sher Afzul, despatching a force of 250 rifles and two guns, besides local levies, in support of Nizam-ul-Mulk another claimant for the throne. Not being strong enough to resist this combination, Sher Afzul again took refuge in Afghanistan, to bide his time there; and Nizam-ul-Mulk reigned in his stead. These were strange proceedings, involving the unauthorised dethronement of a *de facto* ruler, whose authority had been accepted by the people, and with whom we had no quarrel. Stranger still, these proceedings of Colonel Durand received the "full approval" of the Viceroy. Having thus set up a puppet king a British agent with troops had to be moved up to Chitral in order to keep him on his legs. Did this revolutionary violence produce order and security? Not at all. Dr. Robertson the British Agent reported, "We seem to be on a volcano here. . . . the atmosphere of Chitral is one of conspiracy and intrigue." Later on he stated that "the country was in a distracted condition, torn by factions; the Mehtar was highly unpopular; the English were looked upon with suspicion and dislike by the influential classes." And this is how he describes the unhappy puppet king: "An unnerved terror-stricken Chief, who was conscious that he ruled on the merest sufferance a thoroughly disaffected people, whose abstention from further outbreaks of violence was entirely due to a doubt and fear lest the Government of India might have the will and also the power to avenge any injury to its nominee." Such was the outcome of our blundering interference. We had, however, to descend to lower depths of discredit and humiliation. Our poor puppet Nizam-ul-Mulk was murdered by his brother Amir-ul-Mulk, who then proclaimed himself Mehtar. Where was our control then? Our local agent Lieut. Gurdon, far from controlling events, found himself in a very precarious position, and was compelled to receive personal visits from this Amir-ul-Mulk, redhanded from the murder of his brother, our friend and nominee. And things became still worse when Dr. Robertson arrived at Chitral, and found himself shut up in the fort with the murderer, and besieged by Sher Afzul. Misfortune makes us acquainted with strange bed-fellows; and Dr. Robertson reported that his only hope was "by showing that he and Amir-ul-Mulk were working in thorough accord." Comment upon such a degrading situation seems unnecessary. The outcome of all this costly blundering was that our wretched puppet was murdered under our very eyes, and that our representative immediately afterwards was found fighting for his life on the side of the murderer, for the purpose of preventing the people of Chitral having as their ruler the man of their choice, that man being the only competent member of the reigning family. So tangled was the knot woven by these marvellous diplomatists that it could not be unloosed. To cut it an expedition of 15,000 men was necessary at a cost of two millions, to be paid by the blameless and starving Indian rayat. *Quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi.*

Does it not seem perverse that our diplomatic wisdom should thus always result in the selection of the unfittest? What is the secret of this perversity? The *causa causans* is inseparable from despotic rule. For it is the nature of despotic governments, and of the agents of despotic governments, to fear and dislike strong and independent men; not recognising the force of the aphorism that, in politics as in physics, where there is no resistance there is no support. Hence despotism, for its tools, must have recourse to the servile and the venal, to those who are willing to betray their own countrymen, and who, when opportunity offers, will betray their employers. Once, on a memorable occasion, Sir John Gorst, when Under-Secretary for India, in an unwonted outburst of candour, bore emphatic testimony to this important truth. It was in the debate on Manipur, in July, 1891, and he pointed out how, in that melancholy imbroglio, the Indian Government had shown its distrust of capable men. Referring to the fable of the tall poppies, and likening the Indian Government to the ancient tyrant of Rome, he declared that "Governments have always hated and discouraged independent and original talent, and they have always loved and promoted docile mediocrity. This is not a new policy. It is as old as Tarquinius Superbus." Keeping strong and independent men at a distance, and relying for their information on spies and traitors, our political officers in these frontier posts become the dupes and tools of local intriguers. Seated on volcanoes they preach Peace, Peace, when there is no peace, and write despatches to Simla that they are lords of all they survey, and that contentment reigns supreme among the tribes, with a diffused feeling of admiration for British wisdom and goodness—when (Oh, what a surprise!) the explosion takes place, and they are hoisted into the air with all their belongings. These are the "experts" upon whom the Government of India depends for guidance in frontier matters; and we in the House of Commons are asked to surrender our judgment and accept their schemes as gospel, however absurd and disastrous the results may be.

W. Wedderburn.

A RETROSPECT AND A MORAL.

By J. Dacosta.

I.

On the 3rd September Sir Henry Fowler, the late Secretary of State for India, called the attention of Parliament to the determination arrived at by the Government as to the occupation of Chitral. In reviewing our relations with that State, he narrated how in 1876 Lord Lytton entered into negotiations with the Máháraja of Kashmir, which resulted in a treaty between the British Government and Kashmir and between Kashmir and Chitral, under which Chitral agreed to acknowledge the suzerainty of Kashmir in consideration of receiving a subsidy. In 1877 a British agency was established at Gilghit avowedly for obtaining information on the progress of events beyond the Kashmir frontier. In 1881 that agency was withdrawn because the experiment had proved unsatisfactory. In 1889 the agency was re-established with an increased subsidy to Chitral and a military force stationed at Gilghit. In the same year the Indian Secretary having inquired about the possibility of opening a road from the Peshawar frontier to Chitral, was informed that the greatest danger in such an undertaking was the deep-rooted and unsurmountable objection of the tribes. In 1892 the subsidy to the Mehtar of Chitral was doubled on condition of his consenting to the construction of the road in question and to the permanent residence of a British officer in his country. In referring to the Indian Government despatch of October 19th, 1892, containing the terms on which the Chitral Residency was formed, Sir H. Fowler said that he was at a disadvantage in quoting from that document, because it had been "freely bowdlerised," and he explained his remark by saying:—

"When the Indian Government considers any question, every member of that Government has a right to record his dissent from the despatch which is sent to England. That right is given by virtue of an Act of Parliament, and that dissent is bound to be submitted to the Secretary of State. It seems to me that when the Secretary of State lays a despatch on the Table of this House, to which despatch there were dissents, those dissents should accompany the despatch, so that the House should be in a position to know whether the despatch was or was not unanimous and what were the reasons which induced certain members of the Government to dissent from it. This is not a unanimous despatch; there are very important and serious dissents from it."

In August, 1892, Aman-ul-Mulk, the Mehtar of Chitral, died after a rule of thirty years, and was succeeded by his son Afzul-ul-Mulk, while his second son Nizam-ul-Mulk fled to Gilghit to seek, as it was said, the protection and support of the British. Soon afterwards Sher Afzul, a brother of the late Mehtar, who had resided abroad, made a descent on Chitral, when Afzul-ul-Mulk was killed and Sher Afzul assumed the Mehtarship. Meanwhile Nizam-ul-Mulk, assisted by the British Agent, marched into Chitral, defeated Sher Afzul and proclaimed himself Mehtar; his accession to the throne is thus described in Dr. Robertson's report of June, 1893:—

"Instead of having to congratulate and form an alliance with a young prince flushed with triumphs over rebellious subjects, we found ourselves called upon to establish on his throne a terror-stricken chief who was conscious that he ruled on sufferance over a thoroughly disaffected people, whose abstention from further outbreaks was due to the fear of the Government of India. That under such circumstances any permanency can be expected for the work accomplished, would be unreasonable. The upper classes have to be won, the Adamzais must be acted upon by the display of the wealth and resources which their ruler possesses as the subsidised ally of Kashmir. That there are many difficulties in the way of carrying out such a line of policy, it would be idle to deny. The Chitralis, however, are impressionable, and the power of influencing them lies with the man of the most tactful speech and the longest purse."

The above passages need elucidation as the Blue Book contains only extracts of papers relating to the subject, and Dr. Robertson's report of 1895 has been suppressed. The reason of the Chitralis being "thoroughly disaffected" was that Nizam-ul-Mulk had become the creature and the tool of an infidel nation, and disqualified as such to rule over a Muhammadan people. The references to "wealth, the longest purse and the upper classes to be won," obviously suggested the necessity of bribery; although our past dealings with the border tribes had shown that all the money we lavished on their chiefs, in order to overcome their fanatic opposition to our presence, had entirely failed to accomplish our purpose.

On the 1st January of the present year, Nizam-ul-Mulk, the British protégé, was put to death by his tribesmen, and his younger brother Amir-ul-Mulk was proclaimed Mehtar. Dr. Robertson was absent from Chitral at the time, and when he returned on the 1st February, an important occurrence took place, of which Sir H. Fowler made no mention —namely, the new Mehtar peremptorily signified to Dr. Robertson that he, the British envoy, must leave the Chitral territory, and that if the British Government desired to hold diplomatic relations with the State, they might send a Muhammadan agent.

II.

Of the danger in which Dr. Robertson was subsequently placed, Sir H. Fowler was officially informed only on the 8th March, and he then telegraphed to the Indian Government to take such action for securing the safety of our agent and his party as they might deem necessary. The Government of India, availing themselves of the discretion thus vested in them, organised a relief force of no less than 15,000 troops, although it was certain that the movements of so large an army in the region in question would be slow, while rapidity was essential to success in that instance. Subsequent events fully revealed the serious disadvantages inseparable from the march of so cumbrous a force.

Sir H. Fowler, in speaking of the campaign which ensued for the rescue of Dr. Robertson, omitted to mention that we had purchased the aid and co-operation of the ex-Khan of Dir, and that his men compelled the Chitralis to raise the seige of the fort in which Dr. Robertson and the survivors of his escort were hard-pressed, and that the British agent was thus released on the 19th April, when the troops sent for his rescue were still too far away to accomplish their mission.

On April 26 the Secretary of State having asked the Indian Government to state their views on the situation was informed in a despatch dated May 8 that "they attached enormous importance to maintaining our position in Chitral because of the risk of foreign occupation, if abandoned: they maintained moreover that it would be unjustifiable to ignore our pledges to preserve the suzerainty of Kashmir." These expressions of opinion appear incongruous and irreconcilable with facts, seeing that the British Cabinet was in a better position to judge of the risk of a Russian advance through Central Asia, than were the officers who compose the Indian Government: and as regards the suzerainty of Kashmir over Chitral, as it had been purchased for purposes entirely our own, it is difficult to imagine why and to whom were given the pledges which are now alleged to interfere with our freedom of action. This mystery cannot be solved with the incomplete information vouchsafed by the Government, seeing that the Blue book contains mere extracts of the despatches of April 26 and May 8. The following passage in the latter document deserves however special attention as having furnished Sir H. Fowler with his chief argument against the retention of Chitral:—

"What must be faced is the consideration of the means whereby we can maintain a sufficient military occupation of the Chitral valley. The difficulty of sending troops and supplies by way of Kashmir and Gilghit and the expense of doing so are so great that some of us would prefer to abandon all attempts to occupy Chitral rather than hold it by so precarious a thread. The alternative is to establish communications from the Peshawar border. The expense of doing so may be prohibitive. We are conscious that it may involve the Government in an expense which the finances of India can ill afford, and in an increase of responsibilities with the tribes on the North-West frontier, which we would fain avoid."

From this view of the Indian Government it is clear, as Sir H. Fowler observed, that if we commit ourselves to the establishment of a permanent garrison at Chitral, we shall be committed to the maintenance of the road from the Peshawar frontier, and that means the occupation of the Chitral State and of the country lying between Chitral and our frontier. Then, referring to the policy in pursuance of which it is urged that we must hold Chitral, the ex-Indian Secretary said :—

"Is the fortification of Chitral a strategic necessity for the adequate defence of the Indian frontier? The late Government availed themselves of the best military advice on that point that they could command. The advice obtained is not in the State papers now published, and it would, therefore, not be right for me to give names; but the opinions expressed were that the gigantic natural geographic defences of our north-west frontier render the advance of an invading army practically impossible, and our position practically impregnable; that Chitral is not a place of much importance as a base for military reserves, or useful as a base for military operations, defensive or offensive; that to lock up troops in the Chitral valley would be an act of the gravest blundering, and that the construction of a military route to Chitral would, in the event of hostilities, be an advantage to an invading force and a disadvantage to a defending force."

Sir H. Fowler said furthermore :—

"Lord Roberts estimated the fighting force of the border tribes at 200,000 men. Have the Government asked themselves whether it would not be better to have these tribes as independent allies, who would form another line of defence, than to have them as revengeful foes? If we succeed in conquering them, we shall have created a permanent source of discontent and danger, and they will seriously weaken our power to resist the attack of any hostile force. A practical question is whether we are going to extend the frontier of India by 250 miles in order to cover a tract of country from which we can derive no possible advantage and obtain no possible revenue, and in which we may be constantly embroiled with independent tribesmen defending their native soil. Sir James Lyall, the late Governor of the Punjab, who knows something about the country in question, declared that the tribes will certainly not consent to our making the projected road, and that it will, therefore, be impossible to construct it unless there is a military occupation of a line 180 miles long.

"As regards the moral question with regard to the proclamation we issued in March, it is clear that if the Government annex any portion of the territory through which our troops passed in March, April, or May, they will have broken their faith, which was pledged in that proclamation.

"What has been the policy of our successors? On August 1st they enquired of the Indian Government whether it would be possible to arrange with the tribes for the construction of the road from Peshawar, and were answered: 'We have avoided openly negotiating with the tribes. The reports from Low and Deane warrant the expectation that a peaceful arrangement for the road can be made.' With this information the present Secretary of State wrote his despatch of August 16th, in which he sums up the position thus :—'It appears from your letter of May 8th that the Indian Government was not without apprehension that the task of opening up this road, if it were to necessitate the military coercion of the tribes, would be one of such great cost and involving such embarrassing complications as to render it of doubtful expediency; but this question depended, in your opinion, on the attitude which might be assumed by the tribes.'

"Our judgment should therefore be reserved until we know whether the arrangements with the tribes have been successful: they have not been successful to the present time."

Sir H. Fowler then cited Lord Lawrence's opinion on our Indian frontier policy, and concluded his speech by declaring that, on behalf of that policy, he ventured to enter his protest against embarking on an enterprise which may be, and which he sincerely believed would be, a constant menace and danger to the security and prosperity of India.

III.

Lord George Hamilton, in replying to the late Indian Secretary, twitted him with concluding a speech of considerable length and vigour by merely observing that the House had not sufficient information to form a judgment on the question before it. If this statement were intended to cause merriment it proved successful, for it did raise laughter; but as an argument or a reply, it seems remarkably inaccurate and misleading, since a distinct and most important question had been placed before the House, namely—whether it was expedient to garrison Chitral, before arrangements had been made with the tribes for the construction of the projected road from the Peshawar frontier. It is, perhaps, a matter for regret that a resolution was not moved on the subject, since the omission resulted in the new Indian Secretary leaving that question unanswered, except by an unsupported statement that "the tribes are ready to fall in with our proposed arrangements." Now, considering that the Indian Government have, for six years, strenuously, but unsuccessfully, striven to obtain the consent of the tribes to our opening the road in question; considering, moreover, that every attempt made by us since 1876 to construct roads in Afghan tribal territory met with strong and persistent opposition, the assertion that the tribes are ready to comply with our wishes on the subject is inexplicable, the more so as it has not subsequently been confirmed, while the attitude of the tribes has, on the contrary, been continuously hostile since the relief of Chitral, their hostility being manifested by shots fired into our camps, at our sentries, and our road-makers, and by our telegraph wires being repeatedly cut and partially carried off. These outrages were recorded in telegrams of May 5, 15, 16, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30 and June 8, published in the *Times*. That paper has lately ceased to publish information on the subject, but Indian journals show that the outrages continued unabated—notably the *Pioneer* of May 21, 22, 23, June 8 and August 3, 7, 8, 9, 21, 22 and 28. Under such circumstances to conclude, from tribesmen having accepted our pay for labour, that the tribes and their leaders are no longer opposed to our constructing military roads in their territory, would be irrational and in direct conflict with all the experience gained by us in Waziristan, the Black Mountain country and other parts of the borderland. For instance, when our negotiations with the Hasanzais, the Akazais and other tribes of the Black Mountain country were unsuccessful, and we sent in 1888 a fully equipped army of 8,000 troops with a transport train of 5,000 mules, under General M'Queen, to coerce the tribes into acquiescence, the General on his return reported that the tribes had tendered their submission and promised that we should in future be free to march through their country and to construct and maintain roads. But as soon as we attempted to avail ourselves of that promise, it was repudiated by Hasan Ali and other tribal chiefs, and our working parties and the troops escorting them, were forthwith expelled from the country. Another large force was sent in 1891 to capture Hasan Ali and subjugate the tribes, but it returned without having accomplished either object. A third expedition sent in 1892 to hunt down and bring in Hasan Ali failed likewise in its mission, and the attempt to make roads in the Black Mountain country has not since been renewed.

Lord G. Hamilton's assertion that the tribes dwelling between the Peshawar frontier and Chitral are now ready to fall in with our proposals for the construction of a road, may have been but an expression of opinion—a conclusion to which we are led on reading an article in the semi-official paper, the *Pioneer* of August 25th, in which a similar opinion is expressed in a statement to the effect that the tribes have willingly taken the pay offered them for labour, and will not be inclined to quarrel with a government which spends its money so freely.

The great strategic value of Chitral has hitherto been pleaded, on the authority of Lord Roberts, as a fact rendering it important that the valley should be occupied by British troops; but the fallacy of that plea has of late been entirely exposed, and Lord G. Hamilton now says:—"I do not think that Chitral is of so great stategic importance as some eminent military men consider; but considerations of a moral character force us to remain; our retiring would be to admit to the whole world that we were unable to perform the task we had undertaken." Can the Indian Secretary really believe that our inability in that respect is not already patent to the world, and that it can be concealed by irrational persistence in an impossible task?

In another part of his speech Lord G. Hamilton attempted to vindicate the "Forward policy" by saying: "The great mass of the modern school with regard to frontier questions are upon this side of the House, and those of the old-fashioned view sit opposite." Instead of partisans had authorities and their opinions been cited, some facility might have been afforded for forming a correct judgment on the merits of the two policies. I believe that I am right when I say that the bugbear of a Russian invasion has long been exploded, and that the Parliamentary majority who support the Government in its frontier policy, are actuated, not by any serious fear of a Russian attack upon northern India, but by the hope that their support will enable the Government to pass certain measures which they consider favourable to their and their constituents' interests.

Another passage again in Lord G. Hamilton's speech deserves attention. He said: "In my judgment no external policy however bold and no frontier performance however heroic can compensate for the permanent annual deficiency of the Indian Exchequer. I believe that the constantly increasing taxation is a serious danger to the stability of the Indian Government, and therefore I looked with apprehension on the words that the Indian Government used in admitting that their proposals might be prohibitive by reason of the expenditure involved."

Well might the reader ask whether these words were uttered in derision, seeing how flagrantly the sentiments which they profess have been violated by the Government; how taxation has been constantly increased to defray an external policy of astounding rashness and folly—a policy requiring British garrisons to be isolated in mountainous and hostile regions, where our soldiers have been driven to heroic performances in defending or in losing their lives; how the troops commanded by the late Captain Ross, those led by Colonel Kelly and the garrison of the Chitral fort were driven to such action without being able to fulfil their respective missions, these having proved to be tasks virtually impossible to accomplish. The courage the energy and the endurance of our soldiers have awakened universal admiration and sympathy, but have resulted in no advantage to their nation, unless it be a satisfaction to narrate their deeds. The policy responsible for this waste of blood and treasure, was already accountable for the cruel isolation and massacre of Sir Louis Cavagnari and his escort, and for the many disasters and humiliations which have, since 1878, lowered British prestige among our Indian fellow-subjects and among the tribal neighbours whom we vainly and without provocation, attempted to subjugate. A most regrettable feature of that policy is its constant and growing need of bribery for accomplishing what it professes to accomplish by force of arms and superiority in the science of war. The subsidies to princes and tribal chiefs, added to the cost of actual warfare, constitute a heavy and increasing drain on the revenues of India which Parliament intrusted to a principal Secretary of State with the distinct stipulation, in the Act of 1858, *for the better government of India*, that no portion of those revenues was to be diverted for military operations beyond the Indian frontier. The violation of that Act amounts to a violation of the British Constitution which it is the first duty of the representatives of the nation, sitting in Parliament, to defend and to support.

J. Dacosta.

SIR H. FOWLER'S SPEECH.

By An Anglo-Indian.

Sir Henry Fowler, on Tuesday afternoon, September 3rd, appeared in the character which the gods are said to regard with respect—mingled with pity which is not altogether respectful—that of a good man struggling against adverse fate. And he did struggle manfully for the space of wellnigh two hours, thereby filling nearly six columns of the *Times*. Only six months previously, he, as wielder, for the time, of the virtually unlimited military forces of our Indian empire and guardian of its very limited financial resources, had sanctioned the launching of a whole army corps far beyond the Indian boundary amidst the mountain peaks and grim defiles of the Hindu Kush. By this time he had already found that it was ten times easier to project a large army into these perilous regions than to recall any considerable portion of it. His successors, with a promptitude worthy of a wiser and honester cause, had set themselves to contrive that as small a portion as possible of that force should be withdrawn from the foreign and inhospitable territory in which it had been deliberately entangled. So, now, the ex-Secretary of State for India, only yesterday the "Great Mogul," had, as a mere humble member of Parliament, to set himself to combat and expose the long course of meddling and aggressive policy of which that new invasion of High Asia was only one incident, and one long prepared for by those Simla authorities whom he had found himself unable to restrain. It has been said that not even genius can extricate a statesman from a false position. Hence Sir Henry Fowler, personally, was entitled to sympathy in the efforts that he put forth with all his talent and energy to cover his honourable, though too tardy retreat from the malign policy in which he had found himself, a few months before, helplessly enmeshed. The member for Cardiff (who followed in the debate) went so far as to say: "Surely nothing could be more immoral than his (the late Secretary's) conduct in sanctioning invasion and then trying to wash his hands of responsibility in face of the general election." But one must not endorse that debating gibe. Mr. Maclean is nothing if not combative.

Sir Henry Fowler's difficulty arose from his being, until quite recently, wholly unacquainted with the secret, but only real history in the long drawn out and cunningly devised scheme of which the muddle with Umra Khan and the catastrophe at Chitral were but inevitable incidents. His great speech is the record of his valorous efforts, at the eleventh hour, to overcome his own disabilities. As such it is worthy of commendation; but that deficiency of previous information underlies all his narrative and detracts seriously from its political and historical value. The great Pitt told a gossiping news hunter that for his part he "could not find time to read the papers;" and Sir Henry has not found time to con the pages of INDIA, or he would have learned, so long since as 1892, much essential information regarding the origins of the perversely provoked troubles in the Hindu Kush, which, at this late date, he has had to make such desperate attempts to unravel. Had Mr. Fowler followed up, for instance, the clue afforded by Mr. Seymour Keay's well-founded interpellation early in May, and had he given more serious attention to the weighty series of questions put in April by the member for Banffshire, he would have been ready, at the proper time in the debate on the Address, to deal with the whole subject from its roots, instead of then making the poor excuse of "waiting for papers," which, in the shape of this Chitral Blue Book, prove to be little better than a deceptive concoction. No doubt Sir H. Fowler begins now to appreciate this retrospective aspect of the skilfully veiled revolution in Indian policy that has been going on since 1876—much more so than, for instance, does Sir William Harcourt. That sinister document on the first page of the disingenuous Blue Book on Chitral (dated so long since as 1877) must have opened his eyes in this direction.

In an early portion of his speech he ventured on the mild criticism that "our connexion with Chitral arose through our connexion with the ruler of Kashmir. It is a very shadowy connexion, which it is very difficult to trace until we get within very recent times." There is no difficulty about it, for those who will go the right way to look into the matter. Sir H. Fowler's passing reference to the creation of the Kashmir kingdom—as one incident in Lord Dalhousie's nefariously contrived conquest of the Punjab—was quite beside the mark. It is these "recent times," since 1876, that we have to do with in dealing with the present disorders. That specious and misleading phrase in the Simla letter of June, 1877, about "the anxiety of the Chitral chief to become the vassal of Kashmir" affords a pertinent clue to this mystery of political iniquity, which might have been followed up long since in the pages of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* and elsewhere.

There are two threads of sophistry running through this story of the twenty years' official conspiracy that the ex-Indian Secretary struggled against, but which all his quotations failed to unravel. One of his own sentences seems conveniently, though only too vaguely, to indicate these delusions. Thus: "The result amounts to this—that a treaty was concluded between the British Government [by the Secret Political Department at Simla] and Kashmir; and that a treaty was also concluded between Kashmir and Chitral under which Chitral submitted to the suzerainty of Kashmir in exchange for a subsidy." This, of course, is the audacious plea of the defendants—the irresponsible departmental authorities at Simla and the India Office. Were there in these days any independent jurists worthy of the high calling of their predecessors, such men could show Sir H. Fowler that these international transactions so plausibly stated are but the "result" of chicanery and *force majeure*—illegal from beginning to end. And yet these have been used as a sort of stalking horse, all through, in every presentation of the defendants' case, both in official statements and through the two "inspired" dailies. In March last, when the long incubated scheme of the big expedition had to be justified somehow, the confiding Lord Elgin was put up in the Legislative Council at Calcutta to recite a manifesto, carefully prepared for him by the Political Department. The text and key-note of that was the ingenious fudge about the Mehtar of Chitral being under the suzerainty of Kashmir, for which, in turn, the Indian Government was held out as responsible. And so it is, but in a very different sense from that implied by international law. The Mehtar whom we had allowed to be despatched was only a pawn created by the Simla schemers—see No. 12 of the Blue Book, "the voluntary decision (!) of the elder son, Nizur-ul-Mulk, to place himself in the hands of the British Agent;" in whose hands, indeed, he had been from the first. This "suzerainty" had been, as already intimated, invented long before. But it will be found that there never was any real treaty of allegiance from the old Mehtar Aman to Kashmir. At most it was only an expression of good-will and a polite form of demand for cash. It was, in fact, the levying of blackmail on Kashmir on condition of Aman consenting to refrain from raids on Gilghit and the adjacent valleys. Subsequently, the shrewd old Mehtar seems to have revoked his submission; and, finding that the British were behind Kashmir, he stirred up, or tried to stir up, a *jehad* against the "Feringhis." Of course, this and many more weighty matters are not to be found in the "bowdlerised" Blue Book. Since the death of Aman, the British Resident in Kashmir and the Simla Political Department, have set up their own puppets one after the other, and wantonly destroyed the independence of Chitral as also of Chilas, Hunza, and Nagar. The latest transaction of the sort is the farce of Dr. Robertson's installation of the little boy as Mehtar the other day. Ever since the death of the old Mehtar had there been any honest desire to save Chitral from "the kind of trouble which at any moment may arise" (a Blue Book phrase) there was at least the rightful successor, the strong and capable Sher Afzul, who would have secured the independence of the State and served as a national defender against the Muscovite bogey. But Sher Afzul is one of that order of "tall poppies" whom the Simla Tarquins have always sought to cut down, from H.H. Shere Ali in 1878 to the present. So the puppet Mehtar, set up the other day, serves as a pawn to be brought forward at each turn of the scheme for our continued and persistent aggressions in High Asia, far beyond the boundaries of India.[1]

But the master key, to the more recent phases (that is since 1884) of the revolutionary proceedings beyond the Indian frontier, is that which Sir Henry Fowler utterly failed to turn; though he did get hold of the handle in that phrase of his, "Proposals made to (not by) Lord Lytton with reference to the reconstruction of the arrangements then (1877) existing between the Indian Government and the Government of Kashmir." In this connexion the term "reconstruction" is, indeed, a blessed word! Also, to speak of "negotiations with the Máháràja of Kashmir" sounds like bitter irony when applied to the disgraceful story of his undoing, and of that wholesale absorption of his kingdom, with its resources, in pursuance of the reckless and rapacious schemes in High Asia of which India is now reaping the bitter fruit. Because of his failure to master the history of the "arrangements" furtively set on foot under Lord Lytton, weakly consented to by Lord Ripon, more actively promoted under the Marquis of Dufferin, and finally carried through, as above, under the Marquis of Lansdowne and Lord Cross, Sir Henry Fowler's review of the present situation is defective all through. But, except for his pre-occupation with domestic politics, Sir Henry need not have been ignorant. He was a member of the House when in July, 1890, Mr. Bradlaugh brought forward his unanswerable indictment against the Government of India in regard to its politically unjustifiable deposition of the Máhárája and the supersession of his State.

Here it is desirable just to refer back to these former incidents of violence (in 1890-1) when, by dint of utilising the resources and in the name of Kashmir, that ugly rush was made on Gilghit, when its forts were stormed, and the States of Hunza and Nagyr were also destroyed politically, as well as Chilas and Yassin on the eastern side of the Chitral State. Sir Henry Fowler seems to have forgotten and skips over that episode of rapine and bloodshed, which was involved in what is euphoniously described as the "re-establishment of the Gilghit Agency." He had, indeed, the excuse that one of the artifices by which this Blue Book has been concocted is the entire omission of all record of that ruthless invasion, though there are repeated enumerations of the several troops, mainly those of Kashmir, employed on these operations. But it is well enough known that the intrigues and Pigottism which led up to the supersession of Kashmir had for their objective the seizure of Gilghit as a new centre for the aggressive Simla schemes that have since been followed up with disastrous results, of which we do not yet see an end. To use again our chess comparison, Kashmir was made to serve for the knight-piece's "slantingdicular" move in the ever grasping game of the Simla Political Department. Kashmir was the helpless but useful tool of that clique; and the history of the disorders beyond the northern frontiers of India during the past ten years can only be understood when it is recognised that the pivot of these aggressions was the *coup d'état* by which Kashmir itself was destroyed as an independent kingdom.

But seeing that such official documents as record the steps in the revolutionary policy, of which Sir Henry Fowler could only touch the later fringe in his great oration, have been systematically kept back from Parliament, one would require a volume to supply the omissions. Here I have only indicated the directions in which independent investigation should be pursued. And now that this belated Blue Book has appeared, no words are strong enough to describe the disingenuousness with which it has been compiled since the new Secretary of State came into office. Though not so violently mutilated as were the notorious despatches on the first Afghan war in the Palmerston-Hobhouse laboratory—of which we have been recently reminded by Captain

---

[1] For the right understanding of incidents in the western Hindu Kush towards the close of 1894, of which the murder of Nizam-ul-Mulk was the turning point, those who desire first-hand information may be referred to (*a*) "The True Story of Chitral," published in the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore, May 16th, 1895, and (*b*) to a paper published (unacknowledged) in the *Bombay Gazette* Summary of June 28th, "The Unpublished Story of the Chitral Imbroglio." This embodies the "Narrative of a Syud with Sher Afzul" (this probably taken from the *Pioneer*). The former of these communications opens with the remark that "it will be seen how absolutely in the dark the Government (of India) were as to the real meaning of events in Chitral." This conviction is emphatically confirmed by the second paper; and this comprises several particulars which would not come within the knowledge of Mr. H. C. Thomson and other "eye-witnesses" of the campaign. As to the more extended history of the proceedings at Gilghit, Hunza, Chilas, etc., of which Chitral is only a subordinate incident, the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for 1890 forward contains much that is useful.

Trotter's biography of Lord Auckland—this Chitral Blue Book is equally misleading in a political sense.

As to the huge imposture regarding the boundaries of India to which Mr. Balfour seems to have become a victim, Sir Henry Fowler found himself unable to deal with that vital question. It is one that will have to be enquired into, so that exposure may show who can be made responsible for the wholesale falsification of maps of the Indian frontier, published, even by the best firms, during the last three or four years under the authority of the India Office.

On two points, one of permanent and retrospective importance, the other of present emergency, Sir Henry Fowler, in course of his speech, did his duty fairly well. The former is that of the systematic and illegal suppression of "Dissents," both of the Viceroy's and the Secretary of State's Councils, which has obtained so frequently during the revolutionary period of Indian policy since 1876. These "Dissents" are intended to provide one of the few safeguards that exist in the constitution of the British Indian Empire. The other and urgent point to which I refer was Sir Henry's eloquent protest against that violation of Lord Elgin's Proclamation to the tribes of Swat and Bajaur, which appears to be intended, and which Lord George Hamilton, with unseemly haste, showed himself anxious to excuse beforehand. Let us trust that this crowning disgrace may yet be averted.

An Anglo Indian.

LORD G. HAMILTON'S BUDGET SPEECH.

By H. Morgan-Browne, LL.B.

The experience which the new Secretary of State for India might reasonably have been supposed to acquire when he was formerly Under Secretary of State does not seem to have stood him in good stead in the recent debate on the Indian Budget. The figures which he gave in Committee of Supply will not bear the test of examination in several important particulars, while apart from occasional discrepancies between his statements and those contained in the accounts of the Government of India, the fallacy of comparing unlike things vitiates most of his conclusions. It is proposed to examine some of these official utterances of the Secretary of State for India, as reported in the *Times* of September 5th, 1895.

Dealing with the financial year 1894-5 (Revised Estimate), Lord G. Hamilton said that the expenditure on military works had been reduced by Rx.1,000,000. The net expenditure on military works as disclosed by the Financial Statement of the Government of India for 1895-6 was as follows for the period covered by that statement:—1893-4 (Accounts) Rx.1,134,714; 1894-5 (Revised Estimate) Rx.951,700; 1895-6 (Budget Estimate) Rx.1,120,500. This shows a reduction in 1894-5 as compared with the previous year of Rx.183,014 instead of the Rx.1,000,000 claimed by Lord G. Hamilton. This discrepancy of about Rx.817,000 is rather a large one. It is impossible to escape the conclusion either

that the statement of the Secretary of State is i
accurate, or that the Accounts of the Government
India do not truly represent the facts of the case,
that the Secretary of State was dealing with figu
made up specially for the occasion and not confo
ing to the ordinary divisions in the official acco
of the Indian Government. Either alternative se
to indicate a highly unsatisfactory state of affair

Lord G. Hamilton, for the purpose of sho
how much more economical is the bureauc
Indian Government than the elective and r
sentative Government of the United King
makes certain comparisons between the grow
the expenditure of the two Governments duri
decade 1884-5 to 1894-5. Here is the comp
which he makes, put into tabular form:—

England.	1884-5.	1894-5.	
Army and Navy	£30,561,000	£35,143,563	
Civil Services and Education	£11,000,000	£15,810,000	
India.			
Total Net Expenditure	Rx.41,907,813	Rx.52,747,800	Rx.

Against this increase of Rx.10,839,987 i
Expenditure Lord G. Hamilton claims to
increase due to Exchange ("not under t
of the Indian Government") of Rx.11,15
then triumphantly points out that but for
there was an actual decrease of expendit
the decade of Rx.316,317. Now these com
absolutely misleading. The English figu
net and are taken from a Parliament
(No. 398 of 1895). The Indian figures are
an old and different system. There was n
figures prepared according to two differe
as there is in existence a Parliamentary p
of 1895) showing the Indian Account
presented according to the same princ
adopted in the Return of net Income
ture for the United Kingdom, while
1894-5 upon the same system are
current Financial Statement for Br
p. 89. But the chief fallacy of Lord
comparison (apart from the futility
English and Indian expenditure) c
paring the increased expenditure u
heads in the English Accounts, wit
expenditure under all heads in the
As there have been large decrease
under certain heads in India (suc
surance), the increase of total ne
considerably less than the increas
of expenditure in which alone the
for the United Kingdom. Agai
penditure of the United Kingdo
a world-wide empire and has no
while the large increase in
Services and Education is chief
increase of about £4,400,000 (
for Education, as compared wi
Education in India of about Rx.

It is obvious that if compari
like must be compared with
possible, or the comparisons wi
leading. Assuming the util

5

way.
f the
t this
partly
It
sed to
ments
tructed
nt dis-
casual
ting up
ountry"
ouses of
sleep on
to under-
Bengal,
Ihe mouth
districts
except in
mortality
st be attri-
ng greater
l by roads,
districts are
ndia railway
pass through
wan at the
years after,
to 1,391,880,
the statement
of India for
ing "ravaged
atement" for
m the malarial
rsons who have
commencement
ng. But those
ase are far from
istrict, says Mr.
ulturists forming
n) all bear traces
be enfeebled by
nsequences."[3]
of Midnapur, ad-
in 1872;[4] at the
516, showing an
se is, however, not
had not Midnapur
from roads and em-
evils of the introduc-
e statement that the
railway-intersected
ng up of the natural
try will be further
a and Jessur. The
the Eastern Bengal
lately, was without a

---

erial Progress of India,"

to British India," 1871-72

30th June, 1888, of the
ngal to the Secretary to the

to British India," No. 22,

...parisons between the expenditure of the richest ...ntry in the world and that of the poorest, ... following figures show how the matter really ...nds:—

I.—*Army* (Ordinary).

	1884-5.	1894-5.	Increase.
..	£16,253,338	£17,973,133	£1,719,795
..	Rx.15,989,714	Rx.22,897,200	Rx.6,907,486

II.—*Total Military Expenditure.*

	1884-5.	1894-5.	Increase or Decrease.
..d ..	£18,600,338	£17,973,133	—£627,205
..	Rx.17,057,865	Rx.24,091,400	+Rx.7,033,535

III.—*Civil Administration.*

	1884-5.	1894-5.	Increase.
..	£6,615,152	£7,063,488	£448,336
..	Rx.13,281,908	Rx.17,645,200	Rx.4,363,292

IV.—*Public Education.*

	1884-5.	1894-5.	Increase.
..	£4,374,751	£8,746,492	£4,371,741
..	Rx.1,035,496	Rx.1,283,700	Rx.248,204

V.—*Military and Civil Services.*
(Total of I. and III.)

	1884-5.	1894-5.	Increase.
	£22,868,490	£25,036,621	£2,168,131
	Rx.29,271,622	Rx.40,542,400	Rx.11,270,778

...ll these figures can be found, or easily ... the official publications already referred ..., the Parliamentary Returns Nos. 319 and ...95 and the Financial Statement of the ...t of India for 1895-6. The contrast ...e growth of expenditure in England and ...ctively upon Education on the one hand ...litary and Civil Services on the other is ...striking. With regard to Education, ...rting with an expenditure far more than ... great for a population only one-sixth ...creased that expenditure during the ...0 per cent. as against an increase in ... 25 per cent. on an amount miserably ... begin with. Taking the rupee as ...a at very nearly its nominal rate of ...we find that the State expenditure on ...head of the population is nearly fifty ...in England as it is in India. On the ...ith regard to Military and Civil ex...nd that India's poverty has been no ...of increase more than four times as ...England. Here is the contrast:—

...e *per cent. during the Decade.*

	England.	India.
...l Services	9 per cent.	38 per cent.
.. ..	100 ,, ,,	25 ,, ,,

...apologist will retort that all this is ...change. This brings us to Lord ...him to set off as "not under the ...overnment of India" the sum of ...creased cost of Exchange. In ... of INDIA the composition and ...ncreased burden of Exchange are ... pp. 285-6, from which it will be ...n of the Secretary of State's is ...e fallacious manipulation of the ...t runs through the whole of his ...gh here to point out that Ex...ly no effect on the expenditure upon education, while of the total increase of Rx. 11,270,778 upon the Military and Civil Services in India during the last decade only about Rx. 4,400,000 is properly due to the fall in Exchange, *i.e.*, is an automatic increase of expenditure "not under the control of the Government of India." Deducting the increase automatically due to the fall in Exchange (including the increased Rupee pay of British soldiers) we find an increase in the cost of the Army and Civil Administration in India of about Rx. 6,870,000 during the last ten years, representing an increase of over 23 per cent. as against 9 per cent. in England; and in this comparison Exchange has properly speaking been entirely eliminated..

Lord G. Hamilton states that the increase in Indian Revenues from 1884-5 to 1894-5 is Rx. 12,216,933. This figure is an approximation to the increase in Net Revenue shown under the old system of presenting Net Revenue (*i.e.*, Rx.12,490,791), though it is not easy to understand how he arrived at that particular sum. The true increase in Net Revenue from 1884-5 to 1894-5 is considerably more than this according to the new and better method of calculating Income and Expenditure. According to this system as shown in the Parliamentary Papers already cited the increase in Indian Revenues for the last decade is Rx. 13,907,397. Lord G. Hamilton by going outside the period he has himself chosen for comparison and making some abstruse calculations about remissions of taxation in 1882 (unfortunately of very short duration) asserts that only about Rx. 3,000,000 of this increase is due to increased taxation. This is preposterous. The following figures show approximately the present annual product of the chief additional taxation imposed since 1884-5:—

	Rx.
Income-tax (1886)	1,000,000
Enhancement of salt-tax (1888) ..	2,000,000
Customs duties (1888, 1893, 1894)	3,000,000
Patwari cess	250,000
	Rx.6,250,000

In 1895-6 a full year's receipts from the cotton duties will add another Rx. 1,000,000 to the amount raised by additional taxation since 1884-5. The following figures show approximately the distribution of the increase in the Net Revenues from 1884-5 to 1894-5, according to the papers already cited.

	1884-5.	1894-5.	Increase or Decrease.
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Land Revenue, etc.	22,600,000	26,800,000	+4,200,000
Opium	5,800,000	5,700,000	—100,000
Taxation	18,200,000	27,700,000	+9,500,000
Other Receipts ..	200,000	500,000	+300,000
	Rx.46,800,000	Rx.60,700,000	Rx.13,900,000

Now it must be remembered that the large increase in the Land Revenue is chiefly due to revision and enhancement of Land Assessments all over India, which has meant a very considerable tightening of the tax-collector's screw. Of the Rx. 9,500,000 increased receipts from taxation, it has just been shown that no less than Rx. 6,250,000 is the present product of new taxes imposed since 1884-5. To put

---

rail
suff
fever
1872,
decre
1,451,
1,888, and
As th
differe
the firs
second,
and Na
by mala
through
Since
1872, a
drainage
Accordin
in a previ
an impor
The grad
proved by
fever. In
13·78 per t
rose to 14
17·41, 18·8
But the c
worse than
evils of obst
ways those
action of a ne
"As long ag
epidemic inf
of the N.-W
disease was r
districts. . . .
water caused a
the surface of
of fertility of
cattle; in certa
villages were fo
continuance of f
Nearly half a
discovery regar
canals was mad
canals and railwa
Oudh, which at o
are now notoriou
tality from fever
thousand of the
25·48 in 1885, 27·5
to a certain extent
again in 1890 to 2
Muttra, Agra and
tained 1,073,333,
populations respecti
56,928, 92,565 and 5
of 1891.[5] In 1891
following districts i
Railway and canal

---

[1] "Statistical Abstract,
[2] "Statement of Moral
for 1871-72, p. 102.
[3] "Statistical Abstract,"
[4] *Ibid.*, No. 10, p. 6.
[5] *Ibid* No. 27, p. 10.

it in another way: new taxation has been imposed in the last ten years which brings in about a third of the total yield of the taxes in 1884-5. Under these circumstances, to say that there has been practically no additional taxation in the last decade is an extraordinary perversion of the facts.

H. Morgan-Browne.

ROADS, RAILWAYS AND CANALS AND THE HEALTH OF INDIA.

By Parbati C. Roy, B.A.

Sametime Member of the Bengal Uncovenanted Civil Service.

England has in her laudable zeal for developing the resources of India constructed roads, railways, and canals, the advantages of which have been, like those of her law courts, not without their disadvantages. India is a vast country, and her requirements are consequently also vast. But her resources are very poor, while the difficulties presented by climatic and physical conditions are very great. In the case of roads and railways those difficulties are increased by the periodical fall of rains, and in some provinces by the overflow of the banks of rivers in consequence thereof. In order that the drainage of the tracts of country intersected by roads and railways should continue unobstructed, it is necessary to build an enormously large number of bridges and culverts, adding to the expenses of construction in a prohibitive manner. As a consequence of this only such openings are left in the roads and railways as are necessary for their safe preservation, though the not very infrequent breaches made therein by floods show that sufficient provisions even for the attainment of that object are wanting. But it is not always that obstructed drainage asserts right of way in this manner. Often the country suffers all the evils consequent on water-logging. The consequence of this is that districts once proverbially healthy have, of late, grown notoriously unhealthy from malaria. A few instances will now be adduced in support of this statement.

One of the healthiest districts in Bengal in the pre-railway time was the district of Burdowan. This district has of late been simply decimated by malarial fever. This fever was pronounced in 1864-65 by a committee appointed to investigate the matter to arise mainly from miasma.[1] At first the Government laid the blame on the people who, it was said, "do not trouble themselves to build houses of bamboo, well raised from the ground, or to sleep on raised beds or platforms of bamboo. They appear to believe that it is the duty of Government to undertake house drainage and the construction of sleeping platforms in all the houses of many of the largest villages of Bengal."[2] A portion of the blame was also laid to the account of the "natural drainage channels of the country,"[3] which it seems had conspired to silt up with the introduction of the rail
Subsequently there was a change in the tone o
Government reports, and it was admitted "tha
fever was owing to obstructed drainage,
through roads, railways, and embankments.
will be seen that Government is not dispo
admit that the roads, railways, and emban
were the only or the chief causes of obs
drainage. But it is sufficient for the pres
cussion that Government admits their partia
influence. The other causes, such as the sil
of the "natural drainage channels of the c
and the neglect of the people to "build h
bamboo well raised from the ground, or to
raised beds or platforms of bamboo," or "
take house drainage," are universal in
specially in districts situated further from t
of the principal rivers. If, therefore, tw
similarly circumstanced in all respects
respect of railways, show different rates of
from malarial fever, that difference mu
buted in the case of the one showi
mortality to obstructed drainage cause
railways, and embankments. Two such
Burdowan and Midnapur. The East I
line intersects Burdowan but does not
Midnapur. The population of Burd
census of 1872 was 1,484,007.[2] Twent
at the census of 1891, it came down
showing a decrease of 92,127; but as
of "Moral and Material Progress
1864-65," mentions this fever as hav
for several years," and as the "S
1871-72 refers also to the ravages fr
fever in Burdowan, the number of pe
actually died from this cause from the
down to 1891 must be very appall
that have not succumbed to the dis
being healthy. In the Burdowan d
Collector Oldham, "they (the agric
about 75 per cent. of the populatio
of disease. They may all be said t
disease—that is by fever and its co

The population of the district
joining Burdowan, was 2,545,17
census of 1891 it rose to 2,63
increase of 86,337.[5] This incre
as great as it should have been
suffered from obstructed drainage
bankments, though it escaped the
tion of railways. The truth of th
increase of malarial fever in
districts is not owing to the silt
drainage channels of the cour
proved by the cases of Nadde
former district is intersected b
Railway, while the latter until

---

[1] "Statement of Moral and Material Progress of India," 1864-65, p. 66.

[2] "Statement of Moral and Material Progress of India," for 1876-77, p. 78.

[3] "Statement of Moral and Material Progress of India," for 1871-72, p. 102.

[1] "Statement of Moral and Ma
for 1877-78, p. 82.

[2] "Statistical Abstract Relating
to 1880-81, p. 8.

[3] Report No. 87 T.-R. dated
Secretary to the Government of B
Government of India, para. 7.

[4] "Statistical Abstract Relatin
p. 8.

[5] *Ibid* No. 27, p. 3.

---

n-
of
or
res
m-
nts
ms
s.
ving
ratic
epre-
dom,
th of
g the
arison
crease.
,390,000
0,839,987
Indian
et off an
e control
,304, and
Exchange
re during
arisons are
es are true
ary Return
prepared on
need to use
nt methods,
aper (No. 319
for 1884-5
ples as those
nd Expendi-
he figures for
given in the
tish India at
G. Hamilton's
of comparing
nsists in com-
nder particular
h the increased
ndian Accounts.
of expenditure
as Famine In-
expenditure is
e in those items
increase is given
the Naval ex-
is on account of
parallel in India;
ngland for Civil
y made up of an
out of £4,800,000)
th an increase for
250,000.
ons are to be made
like, as nearly as
ll be absolutely mis-
ity of making any

ay. The population of Naddea after it had
red for several years from the same malarial
as Burdowan was 1,812,795 at the census of
but fell off to 1,644,108 in 1891, showing a
ase of 168,687. The population of Jessur was
507[1] at the census of 1872. It rose to
827[1] in 1891 showing an increase of 437,320.
e physical conditions were not materially
nt in the case of Burdowan and Midnapur in
t instance, and of Naddea and Jessore in the
the decrease in the population of Burdowan
ddea must be held as owing to ravages caused
rial fever, generated by obstructed drainage
railways.

the introduction of the Road-cess Act of
additional cause for the obstruction of
has been introduced into every district.
g to the admission of Government, quoted
ous part of this article, "roads" also play
tant part in water-logging the country.
ally increasing unhealthiness of Bengal is
the increasing ratios of mortality from
1883 the ratio of death from fever was
housand of the population. It successively
16, 15·70, 15·91, 16·38, 16·44, 16·59,
[3] in the following eight years.

se of the N.W. Provinces and Oudh is
that of Bengal. In addition to the
ucted drainage through roads and rail-
unfortunate provinces suffer from the
w cause of disease introduced by canals.
as 1847 it was found that an extensive
uence had pervaded a large portion
Provinces of late years, and that
ore prevalent in the canal-irrigated
It was found that the percolation of
n efflorescence of soda to rise upon
he land, causing not only destruction
he soil, but sterility of women and
in localities all the inhabitants of
und to have enlarged spleen from the
ever."[2]

century has elapsed since the above
ing the unhealthiness caused by
Owing to the action of both
ys the North-West Provinces and
e time were proverbially healthy,
ly unhealthy. The ratio of mor-
which was 18·82 in 1883 per
opulation, rose to 24·35 in 1884,
8 in 1886, and though it fell off
in the three following years, rose
8·21.[3] Districts such as Aligur,
Farekabad, which in 1872 con-
87,689, 1,096,367 and 918,850[4]
ely, showed decreases of 30,159,
0,163, respectively at the census
the deaths from fever in the
ntersected by the East India
s were:—Saharanpur 31·25, Muzaffernegur 30·38, Meerat 27·21, Bulandshahar 23·93, Cawnpur 27·26, Futthapur 31·54 and Allahabad 25·25 per thousand of the population respectively.[1]

It would be tedious to enter into an examination of the deaths from malarial fever in the other provinces of India. But it might be mentioned in passing that while the ratios of deaths from fever per thousand of the population in 1883 were 16·25, 6·60 and 16·21 in Punjab, Madras and Bombay respectively, they rose up to 21·52, 8·6 and 19·60 in 1891.[2]

The over-energetic Government of Sir Charles Elliott, in its zeal for the improvement of the sanitary condition of Bengal, has recently passed an Act for securing improved drainage. The Government and the Railway Companies—to whom, as has been shown above, the present unhealthiness of the climate of most districts is chiefly to be attributed—do not come in for any share of the burden of costs, which is to be entirely borne by the people. The real culprits are thus allowed to go untaxed. The advantages of the drainage works contemplated by the Act are, moreover, of a most doubtful nature. These works will not touch a village which is not within their immediate vicinity. The sanitary conditions of each village depend on circumstances which are peculiar to it; besides, the rivers of Bengal are of a most erratic disposition. The soil is so loose and sandy that sometimes by letting in a stream you open the flood-gates to a destructive current, which sweeps away fields and villages, and after a time silts up again. At other times the silting up is so rapid and persistent that no amount of excavation will keep the channel open. The Government has for many years tried to keep the Bhagirati river open throughout the year, but has failed in its endeavours. Often a stream silts up owing to the silting up of another from which it receives its water. An example of this is furnished by the Buriganga river that flows past by the town of Dacca. In former days this river was navigable throughout the year for big boats and steamers. It is now a kind of lagoon, except during the rainy season. The removal of the silts at its source will not be sufficient to keep it open, as the Dhalleshwari, from which it receives its supply of water, has also dried up at its source. Several instances of a similar nature can easily be supplied. Where a river in Bengal dies out in the usual course of nature, no amount of human skill and exertion can keep it alive. The remedy in such cases lies in resorting to other means for the supply of good drinking water and for facilities of communication.

It is a great pity that the elected members of the Bengal Council failed to do their duty by their countrymen in not entering a strong protest against the Drainage Bill. This must be owing to their ignorance of the real state of things. Nevertheless the blame rests on them. The only hope of escape from the impending danger lies in the members of the district and local boards doing their duty pro-

---

" No. 27, p. 265.
and Material Progress of India,"
No. 27, p. 265.

[1] "North-West Provinces and Oudh Administration Report for 1891-92," p. 172 (Statistics of life.)

[2] "Statistical Abstract," No. 27, pp. 265-67.

---

cor
cor
the
star
Engl
India
England
India
England
India
England
India
England
India
Now a
traced, in
to, namely
398 of 18
Governme
between th
India respe
and the M
especially
England, st
four times a
as large, i
decade by 1
India of only
inadequate t
spent in Ind
Rs.10 = £1,
Education per
times as great
other hand, w
penditure we f
bar to a rate
great as that in
Increas
Military and Civi
Education ..
But the official,
the work of Ex
G. Hamilton's cl
control of the G
Rx.11,156,204—i
the last number
incidence of this i
fully dealt with at
seen that this clai
founded on the san
Indian accounts tha
speech. It is enou
change has practical

perly. Let them exercise their independence, and weigh well all the circumstances of each case before giving their consent to any drainage scheme started by the Government. Let them also discontinue the practice of constructing new roads, and content themselves with removing the obstructions caused to the drainage by the roads already built. Let the income realised from the Road Cess be spent in furnishing the villages with good drinking-water by excavating tanks and sinking wells. When all the villages have been supplied with good drinking-water, and the obstructions caused by the present roads have been removed, then they should take up experimentally the village drainage question.

Most of the evils of the silting up of river beds arise from the dried-up beds being used by the villagers for certain sanitary purposes. The effect of this practice is the pollution of the air of a large and extended tract of country. The hot sun, acting on the exposed filth and rubbish, spreads the germs of disease all around. This can easily be prevented by prohibitory orders under the Criminal Procedure Code, and by making the offence of committing such nuisances cognisable by the police.

I have already dwelt on the unhealthy, sterilizing, and destructive effects of the canals of the Upper Provinces of India, and have shown how Government stands convicted out of its own mouth of the evils caused by its irrigation works. If further evidence were wanted it is furnished by Sir William Hunter, according to whom the rivers, "in the upper part of their course, where their water is carried by canals to the fields, the rich irrigated lands breed fever, and in places destroy and render sterile by a saline crust called *reh*."[1] This knowledge has come upon Government after the construction of the canals; but that does not justify its present apathy and indifference. If it is a crime to do an act which breeds fever and renders sterile, not only the fields, but even "women and cattle," surely the Government stands convicted of it.

The unhealthiness caused by canal irrigation is also visible in Behar, where districts such as Shahabad, which were proverbially healthy before the introduction of canal irrigation, are now hotbeds of malarial fever, owing to the excessive dampness of the soil. There is no hope for the return of the healthiness in the climate of Upper India and Behar so long as canal irrigation continues. The subject is of the greatest possible importance to the health of the people. It is to be hoped that both Indians and their English friends will employ their best efforts in awakening the conscience of Government in the matter.

PARBATI C. ROY.

THE COST OF AGGRESSION.

Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., contributed to the *Saturday Review* of August 24th an article entitled "Chitral, its possible cost—in money and reputation," in the course of which he wrote:—

If the Government will take the trouble to enquire I think they will find that Indian public opinion is solid against this policy of aggression, which has borne bitter fruit for India in the past, and will do the same in the future. And when we consider the arguments put forward by Mr. Balfour for embarking upon these hazardous enterprises, we do not find that they are of a convincing kind; nor do they seem to be based on any high or broad grounds of political justice or experience. The reasons he gives are twofold. First, he considers that the retention of Chitral will maintain, and even increase, our prestige. He says it would be "a serious blow to our prestige if, having once gone to these territories, we were to abandon them," and that our withdrawal would teach a lesson to the tribesmen "which in the future may make them very reluctant to depend upon the British throne." His second reason is that to advance our frontier some 200 miles into these mountainous wilds will cost us little or nothing, and that it will not involve an increase either in the Indian army or in Indian taxation. To both these propositions I demur most emphatically. Surely a good reason for withdrawing is to be found in the fact that we promised to do so; that our good faith is pledged to withdraw as soon as the special objects of the expedition are accomplished. . . . . I have served the Indian Government for about a quarter of a century, a great part of the time in the political department, and I assert that our sheet-anchor, by which we hold India, is our reputation for good faith, for scrupulous fulfilment of our pledges. . . . . Then as regards the second reason, the financial one. We are told that the cost of these enterprises will be something quite small; that there will be no addition to the army, and no addition to the taxation. Mr. Balfour tells us that he has received "most 'reassuring information'" from the Government of India on this head, and he is quite satisfied. This is being quite too confiding. I should have been very much surprised if under the circumstances this reassuring information had not been forthcoming. Does the right honourable gentleman not recollect the circumstances attending the estimates for the last Afghan War? In December 1878, Parliament was called together to give its sanction to the invasion of Afghanistan, and the House of Commons was then (officially) informed that India could well bear the cost of the expedition as she had a surplus of 1¾ millions, and the expenses would not exceed that amount. This was most reassuring information, and the sanction was accordingly obtained; but unfortunately ten days later it was ascertained (also officially) that the supposed surplus was a myth: there was in fact a large deficit; and instead of costing 1¾ millions that Afghan War cost twenty-one millions. Then the Abyssinian War: Mr. Disraeli assured the House of Commons that it would not cost more than three millions, but ten millions were actually spent. And to come to more recent times, the right honourable gentleman will remember the expectations held out by the Government of India of financial profit (ruby mines, and what not) from the annexation of Upper Burma. . . . If through all this expenditure any benefit was to arise either to India or to this country, there would be some excuse for the extravagance; but this forward policy, this embarking in wild enterprises beyond our natural frontier this abandonment of Lord Lawrence's wise and humane policy, is purely mischievous, and may lead to our ruin. It is not a policy of safety but of danger. And it cannot be too often repeated that our only safe policy is that which has for its basis a full treasury, friendly neighbours beyond the frontier, and a contented people throughout India.

---

[1] "History of the Indian People," p. 12.

PREHISTORIC RACES.

The Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times in India, South-Western Asia, and Southern Europe. By J. F. Hewitt, Late Commissioner of Chutia Nagpur. Vol. II. (Westminster: Archibald Constable, and Co.)

At no long distance of time Mr. Hewitt follows up his first volume with a second, in which he pursues the same lines of investigation and speculation. The present volume contains only three essays, but they are extremely comprehensive, and the last two deal with subjects that offer a large amount of interest to the Western world, and especially to the Northern regions of it. Mr. Hewitt is quite as well aware of the difficulties and dangers of his method as any of his critics can be, and although he works out his speculations in positive terms enough, he knows better than to claim finality or infallibility for his results. The decisive estimate of both must be left to the judgment of professed experts capable of bringing to the trial an adequate scientific equipment as well as a sufficient knowledge of the multifarious details. It is hardly worth while to dwell upon isolated points of vulnerability. The essential value of Mr. Hewitt's studies seems to us to lie, less in the utmost details with which he supports his theories, and mainly in the sustained attempt to give body and consistency to vaporous elements of folklore conceptions and national and racial traditions. Regarded in this light, his work must be admitted to be of substantial importance, whatever may be the ultimate fate of any of his particular contentions.

In his seventh essay, the first in the present volume, Mr. Hewitt deals with the astronomy of the Veda, and endeavours to extract from it historical lessons. By a series of extremely ingenious interpretations he reaches the following conclusions :

> "The ancient Hindus first divided the year into two seasons of six months each, beginning in November and marked by the movements of the Pleiades. This year was followed by that of three seasons, the earliest year of the barley-growing races, consecrated to Orion, and beginning at the winter solstice, and in this age time was also measured by the lunar months of gestation. This was followed by the year of five seasons of the mother-bird, the constellation of the polar star Vega, beginning with the summer-solstice and the Indian rainy season, ushered in by the star Sirius. This was the year of Bhishma and of the sons of Yayati. Then came the year of Yudishthira of thirteen lunar months, in which the young sun-god emerged from his yearly bath of death and re-birth in November, was nursed by the moon for three months till February, when he was married to the moon-goddess, as Zeus was wedded to Hera in Gamælion (February). The series of Vedic and Hindu ritualistic measurements closes with the year of twelve months or 360 days, in which the sun-god was born at the winter solstice and wedded to the moon at vernal equinox. This was the year of the bull, and it was to reconcile the discrepancies between this and the lunar year, and to secure a correct measurement of time always available for use that the Nakshatras and five years' cycle was invented."

Further, in discussing the relation of the history of Buddha to the lunar-solar year of the Akkadians, Mr. Hewitt finds that the Buddhist theology is based on ancient astronomical speculations; and he goes on to trace such speculations through every phase of their religious history, discovering in them "the origin of the Buddhist belief in rebirths, and the reproduction in each of these successive births of the condition of the reborn soul, considered by eternal justice to be the fit outcome of the Karma, or sum of the deeds of each individual in his former states of existence."

The eighth essay examines in some detail the mythology of the Northern races. This mythology became interfused with the creeds of the Southern races, and Mr. Hewitt concerns himself particularly with the questions raised by an inquiry into the interaction of the individualizing tendencies of the northern temperaments and the communistic organisation of Southern society. Prominent is the legend of the master-smith, Völundr, Wieland, or Weyland, the father-god of the inventive and self-reliant workers in metal, whose theology superseded the beliefs of the totemistic hunting races of the North. Mr. Hewitt traces the mythic history of Weyland: how he hammered out the year-rings; how he was defeated by Nidung, king of the nether-earth, who made him the maimed or one-legged turner of the pole, which made the stars revolve; how he killed the sons of Nidung, made himself wings, and became the bird-king who brings rain to the mother-mountain whence it is to descend in fertilising rivers. "The whole story of Wieland tells us of the union of the northern hunters and smiths with the Southern races, the farmers of the South, whose supreme god was the rain-god of the heavenly bow." "It is to the mythology of the North that we must look for the history of the birth of the idea of the perpetual struggle between the authors of law and the powers of nature, deemed to be lawless, which developed into the conception of the personal god, the judge, father, and divine ruler of the sons of Danu the judge;" and the supremacy of the father-god of the North, the divine creating will, is asserted decisively in the mythology of the Edda, as well as in the Weyland myth. In the Edda also the process of intermixture of Northern, Eastern, and Southern ideas is still more clearly defined. In the Nibelungen Lied Mr. Hewitt finds that the flying sun-horse is represented by the steed ridden by the sun-knight Sigurd; and in this connection he brings together a vast quantity of curiously interwoven lore. Still more interesting is his reconstruction and exposition of the Stonehenge remains. It was the white horse, "the sun-god of the limestone, flint, and chalk country which was the god of Stonehenge, the temple whose ruins still remain to set before us, with absolute certainty of the correctness of the deduction in its main details, the complete ritual of this primeval worship." The builders, Mr. Hewitt says, belonged to the Bronze Age. The latter part of the following extract indicates noteworthy relations :

> "The inner shrine of the temple is formed by an outer circle of 30 Wiltshire Sarsen stones topped by coping-stones joining their summits. As I shall show presently that the temple certainly depicts the annual course of the sun, there can be no doubt that those 30 stones mark the 30 days of the month of

the lunar-solar year of 360 days, the wheel-year of the chronometry of the Rigveda. Within this circle of 30 stones there was, before the temple had been allowed to fall into ruin, an inner circle of 40 smaller stones, all but four being made of syenite, which must have been brought from Dartmoor. This must have been the original circle of Ia, the god of the house of waters, the god Yah of the Jews, and the Ya-du or holy Ya of the Hindus, whose sacred number is 40. While the 36 syenite stones in this circle reproduce the 36 steps of the Hindu Vishnu, the year-god of the royal race of the Ikshvaku, the sons of the sugar-cane (*iksha*), who are represented in the prastara or rain-wand of the Asha-vala, or horse-tail grass, used in their Soma festival as the sons of the horse."

Additional confirmation of the age of the Stonehenge mythology is discerned by Mr. Hewitt in "the hippodrome which can still be traced about half a mile north of the temple, with which it is connected by an avenue about forty cubits wide." "There can be no doubt whatsoever," Mr. Hewitt affirms, "that this racecourse represents the ancient site of the national games, instituted by the sons of the horse, which are said in Greek tradition to have been founded by Akastus, king of Iolcus, after he had driven out Jason and Medea the sorceress." In connection with the worship of the sun-horse is the varied mythology of the holy wells. For the rest of the chapter let us take Mr. Hewitt's own summary:—

> "I next proceed to show how the Northern Knight, riding on the sun-horse, became in Greece and Asia Minor the physician, Jason, sailing round the heavens in the southern star ship, the constellation Argo; and have traced, by an examination of the Argo story, that of Perseus, the fish-god, and of Herakles, the history they tell of the rise of experimental and scientific knowledge. Towards the end of the essay, I have proved that the myths of Sir Galahad and the Holy Grail, and of the Arthurian cycle, are a reproduction, in a variant and greatly embellished form, of the myth of Sigurd in the Nibelungen Lied, with the addition of the belief of the Eastern sons of the barley and the eight-rayed star in the sanctity of the water of life, the heaven-sent rain, the life-giving blood of god, borne to earth in its cloud-casket to sustain and reproduce life on earth."

For the co-ordination of such varied and complicated masses of material in illustration of the main thesis, it is absolutely necessary to refer the reader to the pages of the Essay.

Equally formidable is the final Essay, which is devoted to the "history of the worship of Ia or Yah, the all-wise fish-sun-god, as told in the mythology of the American-Indians, Scandinavians, Finns, Akkadians, Arabian Assyrian and Syrian Semites, Iranians, Hindus, Chinese, and Japanese." It is impossible for us to indicate, even in the summary of the Preface, which Mr. Hewitt has mercifully provided as a sort of *leitfaden* to the neophyte in these mysteries, the notes of identity between the American-Indian beliefs and those of Asia and Europe. Nor can we attempt to outline the analysis of the Arabian stories of Bulukiya and Janshah, and of Gharib, the poor (*gharib*) sun-god, and his brother Ajib, in order to show "the identity of the Arabian mythic history with other Asiatic and European world-stories of the evolution of religious beliefs which led to the bloodless sacrifices of Soma worship, and of the Zend Haoma ritual, and the rigidly moral creed of Zarathustra, and of the attendant changes in year-reckoning." We will passively take it from Mr. Hewitt that—

> "It is shown how the converging proofs, thence derived, together with others taken from Chinese and Japanese mythology, prove that the age of the worship of the fish-sun-god, and of his father, the god of light, dwelling unseen in his eight-sided temple of the heavens, the home of the eight winds, crowned with the central stone of the heavenly dome, called Solomon's Seal, the symbol of the Masonic Royal Arch, and of the nine gods of heaven, was one of great maritime activity and trade, extending from China on the east to the Atlantic Ocean on the west. It was this age which preceded the war-like period introduced by the invasion and conquests of the Aryans, who have been the creators of modern society in Europe, and have in Asia left the old world to die slowly through the disintegration and stagnation of the living force which once made South-western Asia the ruler of the world. But this slow death, or death-like sleep, is a torpor which will cease with the arrival of the ruler, or ruling race, who can, like the knight of the Holy Ghost in Heine's *Berg-Idyll*, speak the word of power which is to awaken the people of the East from the sleep of ages; who can assume and retain command over the patient and industrious races who laid the foundations of our modern civilisation; who can stimulate their intellects, arouse their aspirations, and make them once more active agents in the regeneration of the world."

The Northern beliefs in the divine creator, according to Mr. Hewitt, started from the totems of the hunting tribes, and this totemistic faith culminated in the worship of the fish-god. The fish, the eel, "showed by his migrations that he knew the secrets of the changes of the seasons, and thus became the symbol of the Il-ja, or El, ultimate source of all life on earth, the all-wise god who gave creating and regenerating power to the waters of the rivers, whence it was distributed through the universe. Hence the fish-god, whose heavenly messenger and prophet was the fish-descended sun rising from the waters of the ocean, became the great Buddha, that is, he who knows (*budh*), the teacher of the world." Now, each Buddha was born under the national Sal-tree, the tree of life before the life-giving grain. "He was thus the god Sāl-manu, the fish-god, who knew all sciences, and brought wisdom to mankind." The Sumerian Sāl-manu, the divine fish worshipped by the Shus of India and of the Euphratean Delta, "was the god of the maritime races dwelling on the coasts of the Indian Ocean, the Napūt Apām, or son of the waters, in the Rigveda, who became the Latin sea-god Neptunus. He was the Jewish Solomon, son of Bathsheba, she of the seven (*sheba*) measures (*bath*), the god of the fifty-two weeks completing the lunar year, who was also the god Ia of the Akkadians, the Yah of the Hindus, and the Yahveh of the Jews." The whole field of speculation is keenly slippery, and Mr. Hewitt is certainly a very adventurous pioneer of discovery.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

SEPTEMBER, 1895.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE. "Why we Went to Chitral."

FORTNIGHTY REVIEW. Robinson, E. Kay, "India and the Vice-Royalty."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). Pope, Rev. G. U., D.D., "Leaves from an Old Indian's Note Book." R. C., "On a Threshing Floor." Mozoomdar, P. C., "Social Relations between Indians and Englishmen."

INVESTOR'S REVIEW. "Indian Finance."

NATIONAL REVIEW. Ward, Col. H., "My Residence in Bhopal."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

SEPTEMBER, 1895.

Hanna, Col. H. B. .... "Indian Problems, II. India's Scientific Frontier: Where is it? What is it?" (Archibald Constable.) ...... 2s. 6d.

Karkaria, R. P. .... "The late K. T. Telang and the Present Political Movement in India." (T. G. Johnson, 121, Fleet Street.) .... — —

Ramsay, Col. H. M. .... "Anthropometry in Bengal." (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Co.) .... — —

The Imposition of the Indian Import Duties on Cotton Goods and Yarns. (Manchester: Marsden and Co., Mercury Works.) .... — —

The Indian Import Duties on Cotton Goods. (Manchester: The United Cotton Manufacturers' Association.) .... — —

"Corolus." .... "The Money of India. New Silver Coinage for the Orient." (Simpkin, Marshall.) .... 0s. 6d.

James, Lionel. .... "With the Chitral Relief Force." (Calcutta: The *Englishman* Press.) .... — —

Thomson, H. C. .... "The Chitral Campaign." (Heinemann.) .... — —

The Lakh Bribery Case of Hyderabad, Deccan. (Bangalore: The Caxton Press.) .... — —

RECENT PARLIAMENTARY PAPER.

[7864.] East India (North-West Frontier)—Correspondence relating to Chitral .... 0s. 6½d.

THIRD AND CHEAP EDITION. NOW READY.

2 *vols.*, 866 *pp.*, *Demy 8vo.* *Price* 7s., *post free.*

CHARLES BRADLAUGH:
A RECORD OF HIS LIFE.
BY HIS DAUGHTER,
HYPATIA BRADLAUGH BONNER.

WITH AN ACCOUNT OF
His Parliamentary Struggle, Politics, and Teachings,
By JOHN M. ROBERTSON.

ALSO,
Second and Superior Edition, with 10 Portraits, etc.
21s., post free.

LONDON:
A. & H. BRADLAUGH BONNER, 1 & 2 Took's Court, E.C.

CELEBRATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF TULSIKRIT RAMAYAN. By Mr F. S. Growse, M.A., C.I.E. Complete in 3 volumes. Fifth Edition. Highly spoken of both by English and Native Press. Also Second-hand books on sale. Price Rs. 3-6 by V.P. Post in India, and 4s. 6d. in England. Apply to Babu Harprasad, Municipal Commissioner, Fatehgarh, N.W.P., India.

A.V.C.BROS
TRY ONCE.

INDIAN SCENTS.
Rare, Jasmine, Thalamboo,
and other Attars, R.1 per tola.
Sandal Attar, as.10 per tola.
Pudukota Billais, each as.10.

NOVELTIES IN INDIAN JEWELLERY,
ETC. MADRAS FASHIONS.

ORNAMENTS SET WITH RUBIES.	Rs. Rs.
Kammals ...	100 to 350
Thodus	30—200
Pathakum ...	35—350
Kathiri Bavalies	70—300
Kurudu Bavalies	15—70
Bullaku	35—250
Nose Screw ...	10—70
Ear Rings ...	50—300

GOLD ORNAMENTS.	
Kasimalai ...	550—700
Kollikal Addigai	60—150
Kappu (bangle)	150—200
Thodas (chains)	150—200
Jaya Rings ...	15—25
Vallam Pebbles	3—25

GOLD HEAD ORNAMENTS.	Rs. Rs.
Gajjulu Nagar ...	35 to 70
Nagar	12—70
Parrot	9—70
Thirugupoo ...	4—7
Half-size do. ...	2-8—7
Sowri Kottai ...	4-8—6-8
Thalamboo ...	2-4—2-8

SILVER JEWELS.	
Golusu (leg chain)	70-120
Chain for watches	7—10
Victor buttons, set	5—6
Locket	3—5
Penholder	3—8
Snuff-box	8—10

All sorts of Silver Vessels, Rs.10 to Rs.100.
Bellmetal Kujah, Rs.5 to Rs.10.
Beneres Laced and Silk Cloths, each Rs.6 to Rs.100.
Kornadu, Female Cloth, Rs.8 to Rs.100.
Terms Cash or V.P.P. All other Jewels, etc., will be supplied. Illustrated "Trade Revealer" on application with half-anna postage stamp.
A. V. Chidambara Iyer Bros.
Mayavaram, Madras Presidency, India.

WANTED.
5,000 MEMBERS TO
THE HINDU FAMILY PROVISION FUND.

Those who subscribe to "*Arya Vartha*," an English Weekly Journal (Annual Subscriptions for India—Burma Rs. 5, Ceylon, Penang and Straits Rs. 6, Europe 12/-), will be enlisted as a member to the said Fund. Rupees 900 for every paid subscriber to the "*Arya Vartha*" will be equally divided amongst the nominee of the paid subscribers who die within the 31st March of every year. Agreement duly registered.

☞ You need not remit your subscription now. Please register your names. The Journal will be out at Madras as soon as 1,000 members are registered. Rules on application, with ½ anna postage stamp.

Manager,
"ARYA VARTHA,"
MAYAVARAM (S. INDIA).

TRADE MARK.
JVARA-HARI.

Is what its name implies, FEVER DESTROYER,
and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. Wood, Captain 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value-payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. Narsinga Row

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office,
I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. Srinivasa, Chairman.

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM CARPOOR" 8 ans., 1 Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free.
To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,
HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY.
43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C. AND 27, SECOND LINE BEACH, MADRAS.

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]
[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 11.]
(NEW SERIES.)]
NOVEMBER, 1895.
[SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID,
[Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus" .. 321
The Commissioners' Programme 326
The Fear of Russia 328
Lord Acton on the Study of History .. 329
OUR LONDON LETTER 331
Indian National Congress: Report of the British Committee, 1894-5 332
Warren Hastings 333
British Opinions on Indian Affairs 334
The Jury Bill 336
SIR CHARLES ELLIOTT'S ADMINISTRATION OF BENGAL, by Parbati C. Roy, B.A. 337
PAGE
ENTRANCE TO THE CIVIL SERVICE, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D 340
THE SCOPE OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION, by H. N. Haridas, F.I.In., M.S.A. 342
THE OBSERVANCE OF THE LAW IN INDIA, by J. Dacosta .. 343
The Bombay Provincial Council 344
REVIEWS: A Noble Life 347
The Buddha and his Religion 348
An Indian Novel 349
Lord Palmerston 350
The Cost of the Shahzada's Visit 351
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects .. 352
Recent Parliamentary Papers 352

Indiana.

I hear from a well-informed correspondent in India that fears are widely entertained among his fellow-countrymen lest the change of Government in the United Kingdom should be followed by some reactionary measures with regard to the native press. "Lord Lansdowne," my correspondent writes, "had favoured the idea of curtailing the liberty of the native press, and now that he is in the Cabinet he may, it is feared, use his influence in that direction. This fear is strengthened by the misrepresentations which Anglo-Indian journals are continually uttering, under the inspiration of influential officials at headquarters, who are notoriously intolerant of native criticism however mild and well-grounded it may be." I trust that the fears to which my correspondent refers may prove to be unfounded. Nothing, certainly, could be more uncalled-for or more tyrannical than an attempt to "gag" the vernacular and Anglo-vernacular press in India. It is, of course, a commonplace on the lips of a certain type of Anglo-Indians that the native press in India is seditious and disloyal. But this grotesque slander has been refuted once for all by Sir Richard Garth who, in his well-known article in the March number of the *Law Magazine and Review*, wrote:

> "I can only say I read native papers myself week after week and never see anything there at all approaching sedition or even disloyalty or disrespect to English rule. What I do find there, and what I rejoice to find, is thoroughly well-deserved censure of the arbitrary conduct of many of the Government officials. I am afraid this is exactly what the Government would wish to repress. I consider it a most wholesome and salutary means of bringing the misconduct of Government officers to the notice not only of the Indian people but of the Courts of Justice."

The whole subject was ably dealt with by Mr. D. E. Wacha in his presidential address at the Provincial Conference held at Belgaum last May. Mr. Wacha was rightly contemptuous of the sweeping accusations which are brought by interested critics against Indian journals. As he said, "any expression of opinion which is opposed to that of organs which advocate the interests of the governing classes is set down as inimical to Government and therefore disloyal. . . . Criticism, in the opinion of the majority of the Anglo-Indian press, must be all rose-water and kisses." To any impartial observer I think the wonder must be, not that the native press criticises the conduct of the authorities as freely as it does, but that as a rule it exercises, under frequent provocation and irritation, such admirable and remarkable self-restraint. Those who hold a contrary opinion either do not read the native press, or would resent any kind of criticism. The best type of Anglo-Indian knows better. He recognises, with Sir Richard Garth, that the native press in India fulfils the function of what would be in this country a loyal Opposition. To "gag" this Opposition, to stifle its criticisms, and to close those avenues of authentic popular opinion which it so usefully opens up would be dangerous, indeed, for the people of India, but it would be disastrous for the Government of India.

As for the habitual tone and temper of the native press, I am disposed to go a little further than Sir Richard Garth and to carry the war for a moment into the enemy's territory. Journals like the *Pioneer*, the *Englishman*, the *Times of India*, and the *Madras Mail* would better consult their dignity if, instead of lecturing the native press, they set it an example. If British observers were to estimate the spirit in which Anglo-Indian officials regard the Indian people, from the general tone of the journals I have mentioned, they could not resist the conclusion that there was deep-seated hatred between rulers and ruled. If the censors of the native press would abandon the language and the manners of the controversial bargee and set an example, as the *Statesman* does, of moderation and good feeling, they would more fitly discharge the duty of elder brothers.

There has been an interesting discussion in Bombay as to the area of new territory acquired by the Government of India since 1880, and it would be well if, so soon as Parliament re-assembles, some member of the House of Commons would move for a return showing the area of territory acquired by the Government of India during the last ten years by frontier expeditions and border conquests; the revenue of these dominions; and the increase of officers and pay, together with the increase of staff and furlough allowances, which their acquisition has involved. The result will inevitably be to show what a colossal amount of money has been wasted upon the annexation of inhospitable territory which is worse than useless both to India and to the United Kingdom. The people of Lancashire ought to be sufficiently interested in preventing further extravagance in India to induce one or other of their representatives to obtain this information from the India Office. The document would also be useful to the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure.

That indefatigable critic of bureaucratic extravagance, Mr. D. E. Wacha, has turned up the "Statistical Abstract of British India" on the subject, and communicated the results of his investigations to a recent issue of the *Bombay Gazette*. In the course of his letter he writes :—

> "For our purposes it will be enough if I give figures of the territorial area at three different but important periods—say, firstly, at the date of the Queen's direct assumption of the Government (1858); secondly, in 1882-83, soon after the second Afghan War; and, thirdly, in 1892-93, when a very large slice of frontier had been added, but prior to the acquisition of Hunza, Nagar, and Gilghit.

1858	area in square miles	856,000
1882	,, ,,	868,256
1892	,, ,,	947,887

> It will be seen that during the twenty-four years that intervened between 1858 and 1882, the increase was 12,256 miles; while during the ten years between 1882 and 1892, the increase was 77,631 miles! Thus, in the latter and shorter period, the increase was 6½ times over that of the former and longer period."

The cause of this remarkable contrast is not far to seek. Under the statesmanlike rule of Lord Lawrence and his immediate successors the "forward" policy, as it is called, was severely discouraged. It was when, from 1875 onwards, that baneful policy, initiated by Mr. Disraeli, Lord Salisbury, and Lord Lytton, began to squander the resources of Indian taxpayers in the quicksands of military aggression, that the area of the Queen's dominions became swollen, with the financial results which India and Lancashire alike have to deplore. But is it not a fallacy—a *petitio principii*—to speak of the added area as part of British India when it is contrary to statute for the Government of India to undertake trans-frontier operations without the consent of both Houses of Parliament?

It will be remembered that Lord Rosebery, in the speech which he delivered at the Royal Albert Hall on July 5th, went out of his way to explain that in deciding to withdraw from Chitral he and his colleagues had been unanimous. Lord Rosebery returned to the subject in his important speech at Scarborough on October 19th, and criticised—none too severely—the meagreness of the Blue-book which Lord Salisbury's Government has issued. His words were :—

> "With regard to Chitral, none of you here, I venture to say, is in a position to form an opinion, and I will tell you why: because the only Blue-book of information which the Government has chosen to give you on the subject is the most scanty that it has ever been my fortune to see. It was said of a great philosopher that he could construct the entire frame of a leviathan if you presented him with a single small bone, and I am inclined to think that Her Majesty's Government think we ought to be philosophers of that type, and from the small bone of the Blue-book we ought to be able to construct in our own imagination the whole mass of information they have at their disposal. As I cannot lay that information before you, I can only say this, that it appeared to the late Government—which, after all, though mistaken, was not composed of fools—to be so absolutely overwhelming on one side of the question that they could not conceive any doubt arising upon it. And I think even if you read the debate in the House of Commons, framed as it was out of such narrow materials, you will feel the overwhelming mass of argument was even there on the side of our decision, and I can therefore only come to the belief that Her Majesty's new Government, finding ready to their hand an opportunity of differing with her Majesty's late Government, could not for the lives of them resist the temptation."

It may, perhaps, be doubted whether Lord Salisbury and his colleagues were animated by a motive so petty and absurd as this. It was Lord Salisbury and Lord Beaconsfield who invented the "forward" frontier policy, as it is called, and the less intelligent sections of the Tory party are still as fond as they ever were of military aggression—especially at the expense of others. Moreover, candour compels us to add that, although Lord Rosebery's Government came to the right decision in the end, they took an unconscionably long time to make up their minds. They discouraged and evaded the attempts of the Indian Parliamentary Committee to obtain information in the House of Commons, and by their failure to make that information public they paved the way for an easy reversal of their decision at the hands of their successors. The Liberal party have, and will have, no lack of opportunity to prove their sincerity with regard to the Chitral disaster. Let them probe beneath the surface, make themselves familiar with the grave facts relating to Indian military expenditure, and grapple with the subject at their public meetings. They can hardly do better than make a start in Lancashire, where, as Lord Rosebery truly said, the electors have now discovered that they were "fooled" in their expectation that Lord Salisbury's Government would repeal the import duties on cotton goods. That impost has brought Indian financial problems home to "men's business and bosoms" in Lancashire, and there will probably never be a more hopeful occasion for winning their support to a policy of "peace, retrenchment and reform" in India.

The "forward" frontier policy has much to answer for. Witness, *inter alia*, the following paragraph from the newspapers of October 22nd :

> "Dr. Benson held an inquest at Willesden last evening on Alfred Rowland, aged twenty-nine, of Stafford Mews, Kilburn, who fell dead while working as a builder's labourer near the High Road, Willesden Green. The evidence showed that the deceased had been eight years a soldier in India and Afghanistan, and came home a year ago, marrying three months afterwards. The medical evidence showed that death was due to aneurism of the heart, and the coroner remarked that many soldiers had the heart walls injured by forced marches abroad."

The advocates of the "forward" frontier policy have, of course, always held that, in spite of superficial evidence to the contrary, there is nothing which the warlike tribes beyond the Indian frontier desire so much as to be taken under British rule. But it remained for Surgeon-General A. C. C. De Renzy to enlighten a sceptical world as to the causes of this phenomenon. They may, it seems, be summed up in the one word "potatoes." Kind words are more than coronets, and new potatoes than tribal independence. Thanks to the action of Colonel Macaulay the finest potatoes are, says Surgeon-General A. C. C. De Renzy, grown in the Waziri Hills.

> "If the valleys were opened with roads and bridges or, better still, with light railways a great trade in potatoes with the Punjab would soon spring up. As it is, those rich lands are sealed up and remain undeveloped on account of the insecurity of life and property, and the want of cheap means of communication."

It was potatoes that reclaimed the Khasia Hills. It was potatoes that made the Naga Hills blossom as the rose. We must learn to contemplate the frontier question with the eye of a potato. "There is," says the ingenious Surgeon-General, "no reason why a similar effect should not be seen among the brave races on our North-West frontier, if only Government will make peace, and give the people facilities for bringing their produce to market." Henceforward, therefore, let no man associate military aggression with the "forward" school. They, and they only, are the men of peace. Their mission is first to discipline the hill tribes with machine guns, and then to reclaim the survivors with the gospel of potatoes.

Sir Joseph Leese, addressing his constituents in the Accrington division of Lancashire, on October 19th, expressed the disappointment and indignation which Lancashire electors feel at the tergiversation of the Conservative party with regard to the Indian Import Duties on cotton goods. Whatever opinion may be held as to the reasonableness of the Lancashire demand, it is impossible to justify the shameless way in which the Conservatives employed the question in order to catch votes at the General Election. Commenting on Sir J. Leese's speech, the *St. James's Gazette* wrote that—

> "The Liberal Government was supported by the Conservative leaders against the Lancashire members of both parties."

This is news indeed. What are the facts? Sir H. James's motion of February 21st last, condemning the Cotton Duties, was supported by Lord George Hamilton, who declared from the front Opposition bench that he spoke with the express approval of Lord Salisbury. The Conservative Whips issued a five-lined "whip" to Conservative members in view of the division, and themselves voted with Sir H. James. Moreover, when Lord G. Hamilton, during the actual campaign of the General Election, was invited to speak in Lancashire in support of the Conservative candidates, he replied that his speech in the House and his subsequent appointment to be Secretary of State for India ought to help to secure their election. Nor is that all. Mr. Balfour, in Manchester, was so careful to refrain from approving the Cotton Duties that the *St. James's Gazette* itself charged him with sitting on the fence.

So much for the leaders. What of the Conservative rank and file? It is notorious that during the General Election Conservative candidates in Lancashire made the repeal of the Cotton Duties the chief plank in their electioneering platform. The *St. James's Gazette* suggests that Lancashire members, whether Liberal or Conservative, joined with Sir H. James in attacking the Cotton Duties, while "the Conservative party, as a party, declined to go with them." There is only one disadvantage about this statement, but it is a serious one. It is precisely the reverse of the facts. In the first place, only four Lancashire Liberal members voted for Sir H. James's motion. In the second place, of the Conservative members who were present in the House of Commons when the division was taken, 101 voted against the Cotton Duties, and only 51 for them. The *St. James's Gazette* should learn to cultivate accuracy.

The Council of the Bombay Presidency Association—one of the many excellent and representative public bodies which live and flourish in India in spite of many discouragements—may be regarded as reflecting accurately the general opinion of the Indian community in its resolutions of congratulation to Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., upon his success, and of condolence with Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji upon his defeat, at the late General Election. The resolution referring to Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., is as follows:—

> "That the Council of the Association rejoices with all classes of the Indian community at the re-election of Sir William Wedderburn, who, during the three years of the last Parliament, discharged his onerous and responsible duties not only towards his own constituency with marked ability and devotion, but advocated the best interests of the people of this country with an independence and thorough disinterestedness which have enhanced their confidence in and high regard for him, and earned for himself their life-long gratitude."

"Unfortunately," as Sir W. Wedderburn writes in his acknowledgment of this resolution, "at the last General Election a number of India's best friends failed to obtain seats in the House of Commons, and especially we deplore the loss of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the accredited and representative 'member for India'."

The resolution of the Bombay Presidency Association referring to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji runs as follows:—

> "That the Council of the Association desires to place on record its expression of the deep disappointment and regret which it has felt with all classes of Indians, on the unfortunate exclusion of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji from the House of Commons at the late General Election; and joins in the universal and earnest wish that the generous and liberal-minded electors of Great Britain will endeavour, at the earliest opportunity, to secure the re-election of so tried and trusted a representative who, during the three years of his parliamentary career, had done inestimable service to the best interests of India."

Steps have been taken to bring the wishes of the Indian people in this matter to the knowledge not only of the general body of the British public, but also of leading officials in the Liberal party, and it does not seem unreasonable to claim that, alike in the interests of the United Kingdom and of India, the best efforts should be put forth to secure Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's return to the House of Commons on the first possible occasion.

We discussed in the last number of INDIA the grievances of British Indian subjects in South Africa, to which a deputation organised by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji had called the attention of Mr. Chamberlain at the Colonial Office. Those on whose behalf these representations were made are clearly not ungrateful. A letter of thanks, signed by Mr. Abdul Caader and sixteen other leading Indian residents in South Africa, has been received by Mr. Naoroji, and copies of it have been sent to the other gentlemen who formed the deputation. "We are hoping," write the signatories to this letter, "to enlist the sympathies of our fellow-countrymen in India also." It is already clear that this hope will be fulfilled, as the Indian journals and letters from correspondents in India abundantly testify. It is also clear that all the help which is forthcoming will be necessary in order to defeat what appears to be a concerted attempt throughout South Africa to degrade and insult Indian subjects of the British Crown. We referred last month to the restrictions which had been, or were being, imposed upon British Indian subjects in Cape Colony, Natal, the South African Republic, and the Orange Free State. We now learn from an Indian correspondent in Victoria, Mashonaland, that he and many others of his fellow-countrymen who have been established with their families as traders and, as such, have paid for Government licenses for some years, are now threatened with a refusal of their licenses at the close of the present year. If this scandalous injustice is perpetrated, its authors will be the Chartered Company, from whom, perhaps, little mercy is to be expected. Mr. Chamberlain, however, made it pretty clear in his reply to Mr. Naoroji's deputation that he would disallow the measure which proposed to exclude Indians from the franchise in Natal. Is it unreasonable to expect that he will also prevent the British South Africa Company from instituting an odious racial distinction in order to disturb and dispossess many of our fellow-subjects in Mashonaland?

As the case of the recent religious disturbances at Dhulia in the Bombay Presidency is still *sub judice*, we make no remark as to the innocence or the guilt of individuals, but the *Times* of October 3rd contained a notable letter from Mr. J. B. Goodridge which may well be commended to the attention of Anglo-Indian officials. Mr. Goodridge, who has now retired from the Bengal Civil Service, was formerly Judge and Commissioner in the Central Provinces. He is, therefore, what Lord Lansdowne would call an "expert." Yet he bears witness to the existence of the belief among the Indian people that the policy of the Government in respect of religious differences is a policy of "divide and rule," and he describes the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha as "a very influential and moderate body of public-spirited men." He writes:

> "The present trouble has arisen from a wholly unreasonable and unjustifiable demand on the part of a small section of

> fanatical Muhammadans that no music whatever shall be played in Hindu processions while passing near their mosques. It is only recently that such objections have been seriously raised. The fact is this unreasonable demand is the outcome of the recent anti-cow-killing agitation and the rescuing in some places by the Hindu peasantry of cattle intended for slaughter. British officials who are responsible for the peace of the country have come to regard the Hindus as the aggressors in these religious quarrels; and bigoted Muhammadans think that they now see their opportunity. The erection of a small hut with the designation of a mosque on a thoroughfare is now set up as a sufficient reason for molesting a Hindu religious procession accompanied by music, because it is said the music will disturb public worship, though such processions have from time immemorial passed along such routes without any such objections being raised."

And again:

> "There is certainly a feeling of discontent among the Hindu populations arising from recent interferences by British officials in musical processions which were obviously not in any way intended to annoy, and which it is notorious do not annoy any class of persons, and the idea has undoubtedly gone abroad that British officials are inclined to side with the extreme section of the Muhammadan community in a perfectly unjustifiable demand."

These passages, coming from such a quarter, amount to an admirable corroboration of the opinions consistently urged by independent witnesses in India. The officials are too little in touch with the people. Their conduct, rightly or wrongly, sometimes gives rise to the suspicion that they regard religious animosities between various sections of the Indian community as a source of strength to themselves. Moreover, they resent enquiry and publicity, and when, as in the case of the Bombay riots two years ago, enquiry cannot be wholly avoided, they are apparently concerned to render it as futile as possible. It is to be hoped that Mr. Goodridge's letter will have a salutary effect upon this dangerous official temper, and encourage those methods of conciliation which have been adopted with such excellent results in wisely administered Native States like Gondal.

The thirty-ninth Report of Her Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners, which has just been issued as a Blue-book, contains in the form of an Appendix some important correspondence between the Civil Service Commission, the Treasury, and the India Office upon the holding of examinations for the Home Civil Service and for the Civil Service of India. The first letter, dated April 26th, 1894, is from the Secretary to the Civil Service Commission to the Secretary of the Treasury. Observing that the number of competitors for posts in the Home Civil Service was disproportionate to the number of Clerkships to be filled, and that the amount received in fees was disproportionate to the cost of the examination, the Commissioners proposed that in future the examination should take place concurrently with the Open Competitive Examination to the Civil Service of India.

> "By this arrangement," the letter proceeded, "a considerable economy would be effected as the same examination-papers would serve the double purpose of testing the qualifications of candidates for both the Home and Civil Services. The number of competitors for both Services would probably be materially increased, and there would be a proportionate rise in the amount of fees paid to the Imperial Exchequer. It is also anticipated that a larger number of highly qualified candidates would be induced to enter for the examinations."

The Treasury approved this suggestion but, after some further correspondence, pointed out that the limits of age and the fees payable by candidates were, at present, different in the two Services.

It now seems to have occurred to the Civil Service Commission that the India Office ought to have some voice in determining a new scheme, and on October 17th, 1894—six months, that is to say, after the proposal had been made to the Treasury—the Secretary to the Civil Service Commission wrote to the Under Secretary of State for India laying the proposal before him, and suggesting that, if it were adopted, a rebate of £250 on the amount of the charges borne by India in respect of the examination for the Indian Civil Service should be allowed in the case of the first concurrent examination. The fee for admission to an examination for the Indian Civil Service being £5, and for the Home Civil Service £6, the Commissioners proposed that in future candidates who might enter as competitors for the Indian Civil Service alone should pay £6, while those who entered for both the Indian and the Home Services should pay £8. Other suggestions were made with regard to the limits of age but, as it was finally decided that no alteration in this respect should be made, we need not enter into that matter. The reply from the India Office was that Mr. Secretary Fowler would accept the rebate of £250, and would agree to raising the fee for the Indian examination from £5 to £6. He suggested, however, that the fee of £6 should also be payable by candidates who entered for both examinations, as he was "decidedly of opinion that it is not desirable to throw any difficulty in the way of those who may desire to enter for both Services." This suggestion was ultimately adopted.

Now, the cost of holding a separate examination for the Home Civil Service was, roughly, £500 and, as the Secretary to the Civil Service Commission writes, "Under the proposed new arrangement almost the whole of this expenditure will be saved." Is it not characteristic of official dealings with India that, although the change is avowedly made in the interests of the Home Civil Service alone, only one half of the amount saved is to be credited to India? More than that, the fee for a candidate for the Indian Civil Service is raised by £1, apparently in order to establish one uniform fee alike for candidates for one Service and for candidates for both. The net result is that, while the Indian Civil Service gains no real advantage—for there was no complaint as to the number or the capacity of candidates for its examinations—the Home Civil Service, unless the hopes of the Commissioners are disappointed, will secure a wider field of choice and, at the same time, save £250 a year. Apart altogether from the not unimportant question how the new arrangement may affect the plan, approved by the House of Commons, for holding examinations to the Indian Civil Service simultaneously in India and in London, the India Office would seem to have made a bad bargain.

Sir James Stansfeld's lifelong labours to secure justice for women received appropriate recognition in the testimonial which was presented to him at Westminster Town Hall on October 5th, "by the women of the United Kingdom." Few men have made greater sacrifices for what they believed to be their duty, and no politician has done more than Sir James Stansfeld to raise the moral level of public life. It is notorious that the opinions which he holds on certain subjects have cost him high Parliamentary distinction. His retirement from Parliament is a serious loss not only to the Liberal party, but to the House of Commons and to the country. The inscription on the silver bowl which formed the personal part of the testimonial to Sir James Stansfeld referred to him as "a statesman who has constantly striven for the equality of men and women in all respects before the law, and has felt no personal sacrifices too great in his devotion to freedom, justice and morality." The tribute was well deserved, and Sir James Stansfeld has also the satisfaction of knowing that the policy which he advocated on moral grounds is now admitted to be expedient also on medical grounds. "There is," as he said on October 15th, "at this moment before the public in this country a document, put forth by the highest authority on army medical subjects—the Army Medical Commission,—which declares with regard both to this country and to India that every argument which I have adduced is true, and that the system and practices, for which there could be no defence even if they had been a hygienic success, have been a hygienic failure." One of the last public acts of Sir James Stansfeld before his retirement from the House of Commons was to preside at the luncheon given to Mr. Alfred Webb at the National Liberal Club, on his return from the Indian National Congress. The speech which Sir James Stansfeld delivered on that occasion will not soon be forgotten by those who had the good fortune to hear it.

FIDUS.

THE COMMISSIONERS' PROGRAMME.

The Commission on Indian Expenditure, which "the Queen has been pleased to issue under her "Majesty's royal sign manual," is to renew its sittings in the first week of November. It is appointed to enquire into (*a*) "the administration and "management of the military and civil expenditure "incurred under the authority of the Secretary of "State for India in Council or of the Government of "India," and (*b*) "the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom "and of India for purposes in which both are interested." It is desirable for all concerned to fasten attention upon these separate divisions of the enquiry. If these be rightly construed, the advocates of India's interests need not, perhaps, desire any better programme. But they will need all their vigilance to concentrate enquiry upon the essential purposes so concisely stated. It will behove them to use their influence to keep the course of investigation as free as may be from discursive issues such as are so often raised in desultory discussions upon Indian subjects in Parliament and the press. The "administration and management" of Indian expenditure involve a far ampler scope of enquiry than the late Secretary of State, in his promises to the House of Commons, was allowed to indicate. It may be frankly admitted that the routine work of Indian financial "administration" is well done. The accounts and details, however confusing they may be through successive changes of method, are carefully kept. The "control"—in the sense of check and audit—is sedulously maintained, both by the Provincial and by the Supreme book-keeping authorities. Under the heading (*a*) much will probably depend upon the signification that the Commission may attach to the term "management." Enquiries in this department cannot, it is manifest, be restricted to account-keeping. They must include some serious and explicit estimate, not only of the arithmetical facts of expenditure—which are ready to the hands of Lord Welby and his colleagues—but also of the nature and purposes of the outlay of the Indian Government as enormously increased since 1875. It is to be expected that the Commission will not repeat the mistake made by the Select Committee of 1872-4, of spending its strength upon the Income side of the account, though some few of the items of "cost of collection" may suitably claim attention. It is the out-goings—the application and consumption of the greatly increased funds drawn from the people of India, supplemented as these have been by enormous additions to the debt—to which the Commission is bound, under the heading (*a*), to apply earnest and impartial investigation. Consideration of "management" will inevitably involve enquiry into the principles on which the managers have proceeded, and the purposes that have influenced the higher authorities in applying these principles. It would be futile to examine methods of management without also scrutinizing the causes and forces that have directed Indian expenditure. Finance Ministers have confessed, again and again, that they are not free agents. The Government of India, under the last three viceroyalties, will have much to answer for on its own account. But it is long since that Government, on its civilian side, was able to struggle against "orders from home." Lord Lawrence, good at need, did his best in this sense. Earl Mayo mournfully protested. Lord Northbrook consistently endeavoured to administer the resources of India for her own internal necessities. It was after his time that the flood came; and one of the chief objects of the Commission should be sharply to mark off the rise of the deluge with which Indian financiers are vainly striving, and under which the people of India are helplessly struggling. This vital question of "management", rightly interpreted, comes back to the all-powerful chief Managers—the successive Secretaries of State, the Cabinets of which they are members, and "both Houses of Parliament" to whose stewardship the Act of 1858 expressly committed the financial fortunes of India.

It is perhaps under the heading (*b*) that the more direct and practical side of the Commission's work will come. There is now, to speak broadly, no "apportionment of charge" between the British and the Indian Treasuries. Not only is all expenditure for purposes in which the English and the Indians are interested met by the Indian Treasury and taxpayers, but large items in which England is chiefly interested fall upon India. A glance at the list of "Home Charges", at page 18 of the current "Explanatory Memorandum," will suffice to confirm this proposition. The Commission will therefore be called upon to make a new departure. India bears the whole cost of her government and defences. England pays nothing in respect of the power, profit, and prestige that accrue to her and to the Empire from our rule in India. The question arises, on what principle should the long-delayed apportionment proceed? Stated in abstract form that principle is political equity, and that principle rests on justice and good sense—qualities which are said to pervade the British mind. The case is well expressed by an eminent Anglo-Indian financier thus: "The partnership between England and India "is a compulsory partnership, so far as India is "concerned. India has, practically, no voice in "determining her scale of expenditure, much less "its apportionment. . . . England is a very rich, and "India a very poor country. Some principle of "division of charges should be adopted which will "throw on India a less burden than she would have "to bear under what I may call an arithmetical "division of charges." The obvious fairness of these weighty remarks should commend them to Lord Welby and his colleagues, and we shall assume that, in giving practical application to them, they will justify the assurance expressed by Her Majesty in the phrase: "We, reposing great confidence in "your knowledge and ability, have authorised and "appointed," etc. The economic principle was put in concise form by Sir George (then Major) Wingate, R.E., who wrote early in 1859, when India was just emerging from the throes of the great revolt: "In defining the future financial relations of "India and Great Britain it would seem to be a just "and equitable arrangement to require each country "to furnish that portion of the total cost of govern-"ment which is expended within its own limits and goes "to the support of its own industry." Now, these words obviously suggest that the whole of the Home Charges of India should be borne by the British Treasury. That will probably appear a startling proposal to the well-regulated Treasury mind. But those who weigh Sir G. Wingate's substantial arguments—arguments that have since been accepted by other impartial investigators—will admit that his proposal merits attention on grounds alike of political equity and imperial expediency. Sir G. Wingate places the question upon that plane when he says: "It "would be true wisdom to provide for the future "payment of such of the Home Charges of the Indian "Government as really form tribute out of the Im-"perial Exchequer." He is careful to define the economic meaning of the term "tribute." He remarks, *inter alia*, that "taxes spent in the country "from which they are raised are totally different in "their effect from taxes raised in one country and "spent in another. . . . In this case they con-"stitute no mere transfer of one portion of the "national income from one set of citizens to another, "but are an absolute loss and extinction of the "whole amount drawn from the taxed country." This economic proposition is set out in another form with admirable precision in the concluding passages of Mr. J. S. Mill's chapter on "Distribu-"tion of the Precious Metals," and is familiar to students of political economy. The effect of that "tribute"—the withdrawal from India of some fifteen millions worth of her annual resources in the shape of these Home Charges—in enriching the United Kingdom, and, *pro tanto*, impoverishing our possessions in the great peninsula of the Orient, has been traced out in detail by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and by other writers. So that the Commission will have before it not only the figures but the economic factors that underlie the big totals.

It is necessary, in forming a just estimate of this part of the Commission's task, to grasp the broad facts which Her Majesty desires shall be reported upon "with as little delay as possible." If the Commission should reverse this right order of procedure, and plunge at once into details about special items of these charges, and be drawn into mere departmental disputes, it will miss its way as the Select Committee of 1872-4 missed it. No one is less likely to commit such a mistake than the Chairman of the Commission, Lord Welby. There is, it is clear, one compendious method by which "the "apportionment of charge" could be speedily and satisfactorily determined. It has been suggested that, in strict equity, the United Kingdom should furnish that portion of the total cost of government which is expended within its own limits and goes to the support of its own industry—that is, the sum of £15,739,600, which is set down in the year's Estimates to be disbursed in this country by the Secretary of State for India. If this method were adopted it would settle at once and for all the tiresome controversies about "loss by exchange," and at one stroke relieve India of the extra burden of Rx. 15,134,000 which is imposed upon her under that head for 1895-6. Such a policy would do far more. The customs duties of Rx. 4,500,000, including those on all manufacturing exports to India, would be swept away, and half the pernicious salt-excise also. Under this policy the Indian peoples would expand their industries in every direction, and the demand for British imports would increase by leaps and bounds. Also, the Commission would then need to do little more in respect of the first portion (*a*) of its task than lay down general principles as to the "management" of the Military and Civil Expenditure in India, for the British taxpayer, being directly interested for the first time in the outlay, would speedily, through the proper authority (both Houses), exercise that control over Indian charges which was assigned to the High Court of Parliament by the Act of 1858, but which has hitherto been so grossly neglected. The partnership would then rest on its true basis, and the British nation would, at last, have good right to boast that it had proved itself worthy of imperial sway over its three hundred millions of fellow-citizens in the East. But we are a cautious people, and the Commission may regard the policy indicated here as a counsel of perfection. If so, let it, following the national custom, report in favour of doing right—by halves. Let it urge that one half only of the Indian Home Charges should be borne by the British Treasury; or, if even that be too great a strain on our public spirit, let us accept one-third of the cost of maintaining our Indian heritage, and contribute a bare five millions. The principle of political equity would at least be acknowledged, and even that relief, followed as it would be by "masculine economy" in India, would result in such an access of material prosperity throughout the empire as would set our mills and factories to work again, while the nightmare of Indian financial embarrassment would depart like an evil dream. Certain items of the Indian Home Charges are specially and notoriously discreditable. These will doubtless claim the attention of the Commission. There is, for instance, the charge of £200,000 that we make the Indian rayat pay for the India Office establishment, to say nothing of the cost of erecting the palatial pile itself. We should not dare to ask for corresponding contributions from our colonies. Then there is the sum of Rx. 35,000 which we permit ourselves to exact from India for our China and Persian Embassies. As to those "appropriations," towards keeping up our home garrisons, levied from India, Mr. Hanbury last April did the Commission's work for it. Long since it has been urged by impartial financiers that an Imperial guarantee should be given for the Indian debt. The Indian Finance Minister rightly claims credit for securing the moderate relief afforded in the successful conversion of a large part of the Indian rupee debt. But our guaranteeing of the sterling debt would effect a far higher economy, and ought not to be delayed over a single Session. Then, as a final example, there are the telegraph subsidies—£18,000 of which was sunk in the Red Sea thirty years ago —which are charged to India at the rate of nearly Rx. 100,000 year after year.

THE FEAR OF RUSSIA.

THE *United Service Magazine*, a monthly publication which devotes a considerable portion of its space to alarmist articles intended to justify in the eyes of the public the growth of our army and navy, prints in its October issue a criticism of Colonel Hanna's able work entitled, "Can Russia invade India?" The author of the *critique* is an "Officer of the Indian Staff Corps." Attempting to controvert Colonel Hanna's conclusions, he unconsciously throws much light on the process by which the authorities at Simla beget the panic that is followed by an expedition and the distribution of honours, medals, and military glory—at India's expense. Necessarily many points on which the critic contradicts Colonel Hanna can only be decided by reference to maps and surveys, which the India Office endeavours, not without success, to withhold from the public. But even a civilian can recognise without difficulty the very special character of his pleading and the unwarrantable assumptions that are necessary to support his case.

It is taken for granted that Russia will be able to occupy Afghanistan without much difficulty. Has the memory of 1842 and 1880 so soon perished in India? Or are the Afghans less enamoured of freedom than they were? The occupation of Afghanistan once achieved, the land about Kabul and Kandahar is to be carefully cultivated until these two towns become good military bases. Afghanistan has always been described as a poor and barren country, but Russian rule will, of course, change all that. Chitral is not very dissimilar in character to the country in question, yet not even the most ardent advocate of retention has suggested that any amount of cultivation would render Chitral capable of supporting a large force. Meanwhile the presence of Russia on the Indian frontier is to arouse plots against British rule in India. Nothing is said of plots against Russia in Afghanistan. Finally, after correcting—we make an "Officer of the Indian Staff Corps" a present of the word—some of Colonel Hanna's estimates by reference to the details of the Franco-German war of 1870, his critic—tacitly assuming

(1) that Russia will encounter no opposition from the Afghans;

(2) that transport by military single-line railways, hurriedly laid down, will be as expeditious, or nearly as expeditious, as the best achievements of French or German railway transport in the last war;

(3) that no opposition from England will be met in the Khaiber pass;

(4) that no accidents will check the Russian advance—

concludes that Russia can in three weeks get 100,000 men from Kabul to Peshawar. We will not ask whether the war is supposed to be confined to the North-West frontier, or whether no pressure can be brought to bear on the Russian Government by British fleets in the Black Sea, the Baltic, or the Sea of Japan, all of which would presumably be open at any season when military operations are practicable in the highlands of Afghanistan. Even if we grant all the wild assumptions that are made in favour of Russia, the question still naturally arises, Why should we advance to meet Russia on the Hindu Kush? Is she not as dangerous an antagonist there as at Kabul?

The reply has been partially anticipated in the reference to plots against British rule in India. It is a brutally cynical admission of policy which implies a complete condemnation of our present administration of Indian affairs. Even coming from a professedly interested advocate of the "forward" policy, it startles the reader in no small degree. It runs thus. We must fight Russia away from India, because we shall have "a horde in our rear of every "discontented man in India, armed with Russian "rifles smuggled across the frontier." Russia must therefore never be allowed to occupy Afghanistan; England must face her on the Hindu Kush. There is no proposal, not even a suggestion, that India should be so governed that her peoples should have nothing to gain and everything to lose by such a change of masters as she is represented as welcoming. To prevent all possible misconception on this point, the critic speaks of British rule in India as "a military despotism, for you can call it nothing "else;" and remarks that "a people thus governed "can never be altogether trusted." He fails to see the obvious inference in favour of a rational system of government, or the grotesque absurdity of supposing that a handful of British troops in India could for one short month force our rule on unwilling subjects. The late Professor Seeley pointed out some years ago that to India more than to any other country in the world the well-known political axiom applied that a government exists only so long as it is acceptable to the majority of the governed. If we do our duty to India we may confidently await a Russian advance where we are, with a contented people at our side, not threatened by "a discontented horde "armed with smuggled rifles in our rear." If, on the other hand, we fail in our duty to India, our Empire is as surely doomed as was Napoleon's short-lived Empire in Europe. Whether we meet Russia on the Hindu Kush or in the Valley of the Indus, whether we conquer or are conquered, makes little difference. Victory will prolong British rule in India scarcely more than defeat would hasten its downfall. The mistake of allowing military ambition to control Indian policy has led successive Governments into the extravagant expenditure which must inevitably produce the discontent that alone can make our Russian neighbours dangerous. Yet the only remedy an "Officer of the Indian Staff Corps," and the whole system of which he is merely the representative and mouthpiece, can suggest is further military expeditions and increased expenditure. Error begets error as lie begets lie. Is this rampant militarism to have no end until it perishes in the ruins of an Empire?

LORD ACTON ON THE STUDY OF HISTORY.[1]

There must be many who still remember the striking Inaugural Address of Lord Acton's predecessor in the Chair of Modern History at Cambridge. "History the school of statesmanship" was the text adopted by Professor Seeley for his discourse; and in his subsequent work at Cambridge he never lost sight of the ideal which he set before himself and his audience on that opening day. In pleading for a study of modern history especially, he was asserting the claims of a subject at that time unduly disparaged and regarded with indifference or even with hostility by many of the university authorities. Lord Acton had an easier task. Many causes—the influence of Sir John Seeley himself, of Edward Freeman with his favourite doctrine of the unity of history, of John Richard Green and others, and, above all, the growing tendency to modernise education—have combined to give the study of modern history at the English universities a very different position from that which it once occupied. There is all the more reason for rejoicing in Lord Rosebery's choice of a successor to Professor Seeley. No one can read Lord Acton's Inaugural Address and feel the slightest doubt of his power to maintain and exalt the proud traditions of his Professorship.

Perhaps the most notable quality of the address—more notable even than the wide erudition and deep thought to which every page bears witness—is the high and serious sense that it displays of the historian's calling. For we find here neither the passion of the man of letters, the desire to secure immortality for his work by a splendid style, or vividness of colour, or depth of philosophic thought; nor the passion of the researcher, the desire to dive deeper than any predecessor into out-of-the-way knowledge; nor even the passion for self-effacement, for colourless impartiality, of some of our most admired modern historians; but an aim still higher and more austere. In Lord Acton's view history sits in judgment on the generations. She foregoes her high prerogative, is blind to her sacred duty, when she eschews all ethical pronouncements or regards success as sufficient justification of a crime. "The canonisation of the past" he regards as "more perilous than ignorance."

"Never debase the moral currency in history. . . . "If, in our uncertainty, we must often err, it may "be sometimes better to risk excess in rigour than in "indulgence, for then at least we do no injury by loss "of principle." The protest was needed as against Carlyle, who (to quote Mr. John Morley) was always to be found with Providence on the side of the big battalions; as against Mommsen, for whom no crimes, no wantonness of bloodshed, can make Cæsar other than "the perfect man"; as against Ranke, with his condonation of William III's complicity in the massacre of Glencoe. But Lord Acton sets the pendulum swinging as much too far in the other direction when he urges us to "try others by the "final maxim that governs our own lives." Our moral notions are not necessarily "fluid" because we remember that the moral standard has not been the same for all the generations. Lord Acton himself teaches us to trace moral progress in history and to find in that progress the vindication of religion; but progress consists not merely in a wider fulfilment of the claims of the moral law, but in a growing consciousness of the nature of its claims. We have no right to demand of past ages the same moral sensitiveness it is our duty to require of ourselves. Our historical judgments cannot be just unless they are sympathetic. Yet there has been so much "fluidity" of late that hardly a rogue in all history has been left without his coat of very "fluid" whitewash, and even excess of rigour may be welcomed as a wholesome change. Perhaps the present generation of undergraduates are not so prone as some of their predecessors to follow the lead of Carlyle and Mommsen in worshipping as heroes the commanders of "big battalions." But they are peculiarly liable to the temptation to invent plausible excuses for discreditable actions. Like young Athens in the days of Socrates, they are charmed with the discovery that there are two sides to every question, and to maintain a moral paradox seems an easy way of achieving brilliance. Moreover, they are sadly afraid that to pronounce a stern judgment will draw down upon them the charge of "priggishness"; and they do not understand that to proclaim loudly, "My moral standard is no better "than it should be," as if that were something to boast of, is at least as priggish as to assert, "My "standard is higher than yours." So Lord Acton does a good service by qualifying Madame de Staël's famous saying, that "we forgive whatever "we really understand," with the words of the Duke de Broglie, "Beware of too much explaining lest we "end by too much excusing."

---

[1] "A Lecture on the Study of History," delivered at Cambridge, June 11th, 1895, by Lord Acton, LL.D., D.C.L., Regius Professor of Modern History. (London: Macmillan and Co.)

In the same serious temper Lord Acton shows us how valuable a study modern history may be made. The study of history, as we understand it now, only began with the Renaissance. "Unlike the dreaming "prehistoric world, ours knows the need and the "duty to make itself master of the earlier times "and to forfeit nothing of their wisdom or their "warnings, and has devoted its best energy and "treasure to the sovereign purpose of detecting "error and vindicating entrusted truth." Nor is the help that history gives us merely the help that the Past can give to the Future. It helps us, too, by breaking down the barriers of race and country, by teaching us international ideas. Of special value to us in England, with our unwritten constitution, are the written constitutions of other nations. Then there is the value of the study of great minds, a value all the higher in proportion as stricter research diminishes our stock of accredited heroes and saints. Modern philosophy has tended to substitute the "idea" for the "great man," to regard the prominence of the latter as something almost accidental, due chiefly to his luck in finding expression for the former. But though the modern view presents an important aspect of the truth, we should lose much by adopting it wholly. "We "shall come in the future to teach more and more "by biography," the late Master of Balliol once said, and Lord Acton would probably approve the saying. Again, modern history is "a narrative told "of ourselves, the record of a life which is our own, "of efforts not yet abandoned to repose, of prob-"lems that still entangle the feet and vex the "hearts of men." So that Lord Acton makes a still more cogent appeal for its study than was made by his predecessor. It is not merely a school of statesmanship; it is a school of character as well. Here is something to bring it home to the business and bosoms of all.

Lord Acton finds "the significant and central "feature of the historic cycle" of the last four hundred years in the progress of Europe towards liberty, which began with "the strongest religious "movement and the most refined despotism ever "known," and terminates in "the equal claim of "every man to be unhindered by man in the fulfil-"ment of duty to God—a doctrine laden with storm "and havoc, which is the secret essence of the "Rights of Man, and the indestructible soul of "Revolution." Unlike Carlyle and Froude, he finds ground for believing that progress—"progress in "the direction of organised and assured freedom"—is a reality and not a delusion, not the mere "motion "of creatures whose advance is in the direction of "their tails." The saying of Leibniz that "History "is the true demonstration of Religion" is reaffirmed. The sternness of Lord Acton's ethical judgments does not make him a pessimist. On the contrary his condemnation of much of the Past leads him to hope better things of a Future enriched by experience.

It is not possible here to follow in detail the lecturer's masterly criticisms of the methods of modern historians, or to do more than allude to his tribute to Ranke—"We meet him at every step, "and he has done more for us than other man"—and his reference to Mommsen and Treitschke as "the two greatest of living writers." Without attempting to summarise his weighty maxims for historical students, it will be best to end with his concluding counsel. The lecture begins with the thesis which the late Professor Freeman was never weary of repeating, "the unity of history." It ends with what may be called an assertion of "the unity "of life." What the historian is, that the man will be. A man's notions of history "give his measure; "they denote his character; and, as praise is the "shipwreck of historians, his preferences betray "him more than his aversions. . . . If we lower "our standard in history, we cannot uphold it in "Church or State."

The Marquis of Lansdowne will preside at the Imperial Institute on Monday, November 4th, on the occasion of Colonel Younghusband's lecture on Chitral.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. John Woodburn, C.S.I., Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces, to be a member of the Council of the Governor-General of India, in the room of Sir Alexander Mackenzie, K.C.S I., who was lately appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal.

Her Majesty has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Arthur Strachey, Public Prosecutor and Standing Counsel to Government, North-West Provinces and Oudh, to be a Judge of the High Court of Bombay in the room of Mr. Justice Bayley, who has retired.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Colonel John Pennycuick, R.E., Secretary to the Government of Madras in the Public Works Department, to be a Companion of the Most Exalted Order of the Star of India, on the occasion of the opening of the Periyar Irrigation Works.

An open competitive examination for admission to the Civil Service of India will be held in London, commencing on the 3rd August, 1896. The regulations have just been issued by the Civil Service Commission.

Sir W. Wedderburn M.P., who has spent the greater part of October among his constituents in Banffshire, and Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who has been taking a well-earned rest at Bushey, have returned to town for the next meeting of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure.

Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee leaves London on November 1st, to join his steamer the "Ganges" on the following day at Marseilles, *en route* for Calcutta.

Mr. E. Beckett, M.P., left England for India about a fortnight ago. He is expected to return next March.

Mr. Parbati C. Roy, who contributes to the present issue of India a review of Sir C. Elliott's administration of Bengal, left London for India on October 18. His absence will temporarily deprive the British Committee of the services of one of its most useful members. It is hoped that Mr. Roy, who, we regret to say, has of late suffered in health, may return to give evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure.

Lord Rosebery, it is said, does not contemplate addressing any further political meetings before Christmas, and intends to spends most of the intervening weeks on the Continent.

The Marquis of Lansdowne, K.G., has arrived at Balmoral to replace Lord James of Hereford as Minister in Attendance on the Queen. Lord Lansdowne, who will come to town on leaving Balmoral, intends to spend the winter at Bowood Park, the family place in Wiltshire.

On Sunday evening, October 6th, at Clifton College, an example was set that other great public schools might follow with advantage. Mr. C. W. A. Tait, one of the senior masters, delivered an eloquent and impressive address to the boys on Lord Mayo's work in India. He described his financial reforms, his measures for the spread of education, his encouragement of municipal institutions; and showed how Lord Mayo avoided the danger of trying suddenly to transplant western institutions to an eastern nation and the temptation to try to do everything for a people instead of helping them to do things for themselves. A day of the Viceroy's busy life at Calcutta was vividly described, and the school listened in breathless silence to the story of the visit to the convict establishment in the Andaman islands, and the tragic termination to a brief but memorable career. Many who heard the lecture must have come away with a new interest in India and a new sense of England's responsibilities to her great dependency.

Many stories have been going the rounds about Mr. Henry Reeve, C.B., formerly editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, who died the other day. On one occasion he provoked the contempt of Carlyle. The Sage, in advanced life, was dining out, and Reeve was one of the party. He was in a very didactic mood that night, and attracted Carlyle's attention. After a long scrutiny, Carlyle thus soliloquised with himself in words perfectly audible to his neighbours, "Eh, man, you're a puir, wratched, meeserable cratur."

The death of Sir Charles Hallé came as a surprise as well as a shock. For though Sir Charles had passed his three score and ten, he was full of energy and vitality and as active in his profession as any man twenty years his junior. In fact, the great pianist was actually preparing for a series of concerts at the time of his death. It is only seven years since Sir Charles married Madame Norman Neruda, amid the rejoicings of the musical world.

Mr. Kipling's promised new volume of ballads has again been deferred to another year. The chief poetical interest of the autumn season will centre in Miss Rossetti's posthumous volume, the new volumes of the veteran Mr. Frederic Tennyson, and the new volume of Mr. William Watson. Mr. John Lane will issue Mr. Watson's book shortly. It will take its title from the first poem, "The Father of the Forest," here published for the first time, and will include the fine "Hymn to the Sea" and "The Tomb of Burns." It will have for frontispiece a new portrait of the poet, after a photograph by Mr. Hollyer.

It is announced that Mr. George Meredith's new novel, "The Amazing Marriage," will be published in two volumes by Messrs. Archibald Constable and Co. in the course of the present month.

Mr. Imre Kiralfy, that Prince of showmen, was presented the other day with an illuminated address by the Indians connected with the Empire of India Exhibition. The ceremony was interesting and picturesque. Only those who were immediately concerned were present, and indulged in a quiet little *tamasha* by themselves. To the address, executed in the best style of native art, and presented in the most gracious manner by Mr. C. Ardisher, Mr. Kiralfy as graciously responded, while the visitors drank to his health and prosperity. The Exhibition has been a marked success. Is it too much to hope that its effect may be, in the words of Mr. Kiralfy "further to unite the two countries and promote social feelings between the English people and the race which inhabits our Indian Empire?"

Citizen Sunday has evidently come to stay. The appeal that the pulpit should for one day in the year be used for enforcing the duties of civic life was largely responded to (as the *Westminster Gazette* on October 27th says) by church and chapel alike, and it is to be hoped the result may not be altogether barren. To arouse Londoners to a true sense of their corporate possibilities would seem to be an almost hopeless task. There is so much in the nature of their condition and surroundings antagonistic to any realisation of the kind, that progress must be slow. But there is a faith that can remove mountains, and those who are trying to bring about another state of things must have something of it while they keep pegging away. We are a good way from the ideal London of Mr. Wicksteed, when "poems shall pass on our lips and we shall live poems;" but we have at least our faces set thitherward when we recognise in the words of one of the preachers the true relation between "bogus companies and falsified balance-sheets" and the Eighth Commandment.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

REPORT OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE, 1894-5.

We take the following passages from the report of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress for the present year. The report is signed by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., the Chairman of the Committee:—

Handicapped as the work of the Committee has been by the distractions of an anticipated dissolution, and later by the excitement of a General Election, the year has yet, it is believed, been one of fair progress.

The appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate the financial position of India was a distinct concession to the appeal for enquiry into this matter, so persistently urged by the people of India through the National Congress, and its friends in England. Undoubtedly, though three of the most prominent of these latter found a place on that Commission, its constitution was by no means all that could have been desired, and Sir H. Fowler's declaration that no questions of policy would be open to discussion by the Commission very disappointing. Still the main point remains that while officialdom, here as in India, is ever averse to having the light of public investigation turned fully on the internal aspects of its workings, Sir H. Fowler and his colleagues were compelled by the growing force of public opinion, an opinion created by the Congress and its supporters in India and in England, to concede something of what was asked for. *That*, having done this, they should have endeavoured to restrict the probable practical results of the enquiry, first by the nature of the composition of the body charged with the investigation, and secondly, by the attempt to limit its scope of action to a sort of formal re-audit of the accounts, was perhaps what might have been expected and in no way diminishes the value of the concession as a sign of the growing impossibility of wholly ignoring (as till a very few years ago has been the practice) the reclamations of the people of India.

After all, too, the Royal Warrant for the Commission contains no such proviso as Sir H. Fowler enunciated. On the contrary, it devolves on them the duty of inquiring into the administration and management of the Civil and Military Expenditure of India, and it is difficult to understand how under any possible logical or legal construction of these two words taken together, some aspects at any rate of that Policy, to which has been due the enormous increases in Expenditure during recent years, can escape notice and comment. Moreover, the Commission has been directed to enquire into the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and India for purposes in which both are interested; a subject of great importance that has from its very inception occupied the attention of the Congress. No doubt the recent decision of an overwhelming majority of the Commission to hold its sittings in secret is discouraging, but admitting all this, and taking the most pessimistic view of the results of its labours the Committee are yet of opinion that the appointment of this Commission marks a distinct step forwards, and, beside securing some immediate reforms, will be fraught, as the years run on, with distinct advantages to the people of India, *inter alia* operating, to a certain extent, so long as it sits, as a check upon further official extravagance.

The defeat of Sir H. James's motion against the Cotton Duties is also a hopeful sign. It cannot be denied that, at the moment, Sir H. Fowler ably repelled the attack; but the real secret of the collapse of the assailants consisted in the fact that some idea of practical justice to India, some conception of the baseness of subordinating India's interests to England's pecuniary profits, and using our giant strength to wrong her people in their weakness for our own gain, has begun to take hold upon many British minds now that something more is growing to be realised of the relative position and condition of the two countries.

A further sign of this was the growth of the Indian Parliamentary Committee to the number of 145 members. True, by the late elections no less than sixty of these were lost to India and the House, amongst whom were numbered Mr. Naoroji, Mr. Caine, Mr. McLaren, Mr. H. W. Paul, and others whose names are dear to every Indian, while since the elections Mr. Webb, the late President of the Madras Congress, whom all India knows and appreciates so well, has resigned his seat. But for all that the Committee remains a great and growing fact, and will, it is not doubted, as times run on render more and more assistance to the great cause which it is championing.

Unfortunately this late General Election not only deprived us of too many trusted friends in Parliament, but it failed to concede to us even one consolation—the return of Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, who, after a most gallant fight, was defeated by a small majority at Barrow-in-Furness. It is too early yet to look for any backward swing of the pendulum, but we will hope, even against hope, that bye-elections and an earlier General Election than is now anticipated, will, before very long, restore to us Mr. Naoroji and many others of our friends, and place Mr. Bonnerjee also in the House.

Only one Indian gentleman, it should be noticed, succeeded in getting returned to the present Parliament—Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree—and that in the Conservative interest. From certain interviews with him published in some of the English papers, it appeared that his views on Indian politics were not entirely those of the Congress. But his first speech in the House of Commons showed that his views on the question of Indian Expenditure, as a whole, were not unpatriotic, and it is to be hoped that the more he studies the other questions taken up by the Congress the more he will be in sympathy with them.

Be this as it may, and adverse as the immediate position may seem, the Committee still think that the past year has been one of progress, and look forward hopefully to the future, confident that if they are only supported adequately by the people of India, that future will—it may be slowly but yet surely—brighten for both India and England.

But the position must not be misunderstood. The Government now in power, is by principle, and doubtless conviction, opposed to progressive measures, and therefore to many, if not all, of those reforms on which India's people have set their hearts. It is not expected that in any important matters, despite the Chitral incident (which *primá facie* was rendered possible by the late Secretary of State's failure to send out a formal despatch on the subject) the present Government will attempt any reactionary measures in Indian administration. The spirit of the age is against any such anticipations; but still a vigilant watch is necessary in India, and an immediate and national protest against any retrogressive steps, should such unhappily be attempted. Any immediate progress can hardly be hoped for, but alike to guard against any possible retrograde moves and to prepare for happier times, improvements in organisation, concentration and unity of purpose, have become more and more a necessity of the times, and unless this is zealously and cheerfully provided for and the Committee vigorously supported and strengthened by work in India, they cannot expect their hopeful forecast of the future to be realised.

The chief work of the British Committee during the last twelve months, apart from the constant and watchful attention it gives to all Indian affairs, (as shown by the numerous questions in Parliament, for which it is mainly responsible), has been a detailed examination of Indian Finance for the purposes of the Royal Commission. Owing to the facilities afforded by the maintenance of a well-appointed office, and to the fact that the secretary, Mr. Morgan-Browne, has been able to devote the whole of his time to these matters since his return from India, the Committee feel that no little progress has been made in this important work. On the 18th of June an elaborate note on Sir James Westland's Budget for 1895-6 was issued by the Committee, and subsequently sent to the Secretary of State for India (Sir H. Fowler), with a covering letter from the Indian Parliamentary Committee. This note was also sent to Parliament and the Press both in England and India, where it received considerable attention. On June 26th a Memorandum on Indian Financial Expenditure for the last twenty years was issued by the Committee and similarly circulated. A further elaborate note in connection with the work of the Royal Commission was also prepared at these offices for use by the Commission, but not published for general circulation, as being of a confidential character. All these documents have been put in and circulated to members of the Royal Commission, so that the case against official extravagance has been efficiently laid before that body. From numerous comments in the press, even the *Times* admitting the importance and cogency of the Committee's arguments, the Committee think they may claim to have seriously damaged the official contention that India's financial embarrassments are solely due to the loss by Exchange.

The Committee have recently had before them the grievances of British Indian subjects in the various States in South Africa. Just before the prorogation of Parliament they promoted a fairly successful deputation of Indians resident in England to Mr. Chamberlain at the Colonial Office, by whom the deputation were received in a sympathetic manner. They believe the Colonial Office are giving this matter the most careful attention, and that their efforts to further impress the authorities with the urgency of the case will be productive of good.

WARREN HASTINGS.[1]

The public career of Warren Hastings, after meeting with criticism of every shade of hostility and partiality, has now received a sane appreciation at the hands of Sir John Strachey, Colonel Malleson and others. Of his private life Sir Charles Lawson thinks far too little has been known. It was, indeed, a life which endeared him to many, and earned from them a lasting regard. It does not, however, follow that its details would be of striking interest or value to the general reader. It was, of course, impossible, even in a book of this kind, to avoid any reference to such events as the Governor-Generalship and the impeachment; but the course of conduct which Hastings followed in India is merely indicated in general terms, and there is no detail as to the articles of the impeachment. Judgment, indeed, Sir C. Lawson does not hesitate to give. Hastings was, we are assured, a deeply wronged man, who was left less than unrewarded by a country which owed him much. Burke was the misguided instrument of Francis's malignity. Sir C. Lawson says nothing of the fact that it was the system of the East India Company which Burke attacked, through Hastings. Burke, in reality, accomplished his object, though Hastings left the bar victorious, and, in the words of Mr. Morley, Burke "is entitled to our lasting reverence as the first apostle and great upholder of integrity, mercy and honour in the relations between his countrymen and their humble dependents." The loss of Hastings' fortune, which, but for Pitt, might have been repaired, was foreign to Burke's wishes. Speaking on February 14th, 1791, when a proposal to acquit Warren Hastings was made on the ground that the trial had lasted too long, Burke said that in such a case "it became them not merely to acquit him, but to pay the damages which he had incurred in the course of a prosecution that had originated from their rashness or their injustice." Sir Philip Francis was actuated, according to Sir Charles Lawson, by the most inveterate and personal enmity. In order to paint in darker colours a life which he considers one of the profoundest hypocrisy, he does not hesitate to disagree with generally accepted opinion and declare Philip Francis the author of the "Letters of Junius."

---

[1] "The Private Life of Warren Hastings, First Governor-General of India." By Sir Charles Lawson, Fellow of the University of Madras, etc. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co. New York: Macmillan and Co.)

In connection with the trial, by far the most interesting chapter is devoted to an account of the caricatures which appeared at the time, with many facsimiles of the originals by Gillray. There were two romantic features in the life of Warren Hastings—the successful endeavour, which Macaulay has pictured so vividly, to regain the home of his ancestors, and the lasting and sincere affection which he bestowed upon his "beloved Marian." Sir Charles Lawson offers three of Hastings' letters to his wife as affording "an excellent idea of the tone" of the whole correspondence which passed between them during her enforced absence from him. Hastings gave, during the later years of his life, many proofs of an affectionate disposition. In his youth he lacked opportunity to display it. Its mature force was centred in his wife. She indeed appears to have merited his regard. Her disposition was gentle, her judgment sound, her manner such as to disarm even the prejudices of the English Court. In his long account of Daylesford, and the ancestors and descendants of the Hastings family, the author endeavours to exculpate Hastings' boyhood from the imputation of poverty which Gleig and Macaulay have laid upon it. In view, however, of Hastings' letter to the effect that "when scarcely seven years old" he was "literally dependent upon those whose condition scarcely raised them above the pressure of absolute want," it must be concluded that if those authorities erred, they erred in company with Hastings himself.

The book contains some small inaccuracies in dates. Hastings first reached Calcutta in October, not January, 1750. His first marriage took place not in 1756, but in 1757. Baron Imhoff returned to Germany in 1773, and Hastings married the Baroness on August 8th, 1777, whereas we read that: "It was not until 1775 that the decree of divorce arrived in Calcutta. The Baron then returned to Germany . . . . and the Baroness's marriage with the Governor-General was celebrated with great festivity in Calcutta." There are two excellent photogravures of the portraits of Warren Hastings by Lawrence and by Reynolds, and of Humphrey's vignette of Mrs. Hastings, in addition to many other portraits and pictures scattered through the book.

BRITISH OPINIONS ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

THE RETENTION OF CHITRAL.

The English policy in Chitral, which was so incompetently dealt with in the Parliamentary debates in the crush of the close of the Session, is subjected to fresh discussion by specialists in the columns of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* and of India for October. It is impossible to read these criticisms without a flush of humiliation and anger. In both these periodicals the writers bring to their task a knowledge of the history of the peoples and localities affected by the Chitral Expedition, which renders it still more amazing than ever that such a demonstration should have been planned or executed at all. In India, the subject is handled by several writers from different points of view, and the articles by Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. John Dacosta, and "An Anglo-Indian" will richly reward a close perusal. Nothing could well be more effective than the simple recapitulation of the development of events, with caustic comments, which Sir William Wedderburn makes, and the single sentence in which he sums up the melancholy *impasse* from which Dr. Robertson had to be delivered. "The outcome of all this costly blundering," says Sir William, "was that our wretched puppet was murdered under our very eyes, and that our representative immediately afterwards was found fighting for his life on the side of the murderer, for the purpose of preventing the people of Chitral having as their ruler the man of their choice, that man being the only competent member of the reigning family."

Dr. Leitner justly places strong emphasis on the necessity of supplementing the "bowdlerised" Chitral Blue-book with the information which is absolutely essential to a proper understanding of the business. The "Anglo-Indian," in India, is no less urgent on the same point; "no words," he says, "are strong enough to describe the disingenuousness with which that Blue-book has been compiled since the new Secretary of State came into office." Dr. Leitner is especially concerned to see two documents, which "are the very ones which form the alleged *raison d'être* of the Chitral Expedition and of the Blue-book itself.' These are the treaties referred to, but not published, by one of which the late Mehtar Aman-ul-Mulk is alleged to have acknowledged the suzerainty of Kashmir, and by the other of which, the Durand Treaty, we are said in the Blue-book to have handed over "to Afghanistan the whole of the Kafir country up to Chitral." There is a very special historical and linguistic interest in Kafiristan, which appeals thrillingly to students of language and of prehistoric culture, like Dr. Leitner. There is also involved a further interest which appeals no less effectively to Englishmen at large; and Dr. Leitner is naturally enough amazed that "the tribes that for a thousand years have so bravely resisted Muhammadan slave raids, our dear and loyal friends since the days of Sale at Jellalabad till the recent 'demarcation of the Afghan boundary under the Durand treaty,' alienated its Bashgali section, have been handed over by Christian missionary, and 'righteous' England to inevitable extermination by the surrounding Afghans or Pathans." The knives and bows of the Kafirs will have no chance with the breech-loaders, with which we have so plentifully supplied the Afghans. The whole difficulty might have been avoided by the recognition of Sher Afzul. Why did the Viceroy repudiate Sher Afzul, the plain choice of the Chitralis? Because he offered his friendship "as a favour"—in the independent tone that alone befitted him, and that alone would give value to a ruler of such a country. It only remains, then, to fall back upon the good sense of the Amír of Afghanistan, who may see it to be for his interest, with Russia as well as with England, to restrain his border people from attacks upon the Kafirs.

Why has the alleged Chitral-Kashmir Treaty not been published? We are not surprised that an expert like Dr. Leitner would "like to examine the signature to it," as he examined the seal to Aman-ul-Mulk's supposed instructions to murder Hayward, of the Geographical Society. Dr. Leitner has no belief in its genuineness. "During and after the very time that Aman-ul-Mulk is supposed to have acknowledged the suzerainty of Kashmir," he says, "I had messengers of his staying in the compound of my house at Lahore; and if this alleged treaty had been more than a *façon de parler*, I should certainly have known of it." Dr. Leitner deals exhaustively with Lord Elgin's proclamation. He points out, what is obvious on the face of the document, that it was intended to meet the alleged usurpation of Umra Khan, and that alone; and that it has nothing whatever to do with the protection of Chitral from Russian aggression. "The Government of India," runs the document, "have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass or of interfering with the independence of the tribes." There can be no question, then, that the present retention of the country of and from the Malakand to the east of the Panjkora River is a breach of the proclamation. The specialists are unanimous in attributing all these frontier troubles to our interference. "I have no hesitation," says Dr. Leitner, "in stating that one and all of the complications with Chilas, Hunza-Nagar, the Pamirs and Chitral have solely arisen from the personal ambition of our officials under the influence of the K.C.S.I. or 'K.C.B. mania,' as called by a late commander-in-chief. I assert from my own knowledge that not only in 1866, but also as late as 1886, the very name of Russia was unknown in Dardistan." Besides, it is not possible to read carefully the very first letter in the Blue-book without seeing that the practical annexation of Chitral was contemplated as early, at least, as 1876. This is supported by the fact that in 1889 (page 11 of the Blue-book) the first condition of an increased subsidy to the Mehtar was his assistance in opening up the Peshawar-Chitral road; and the same purpose may be discerned in the gift of the lower part of Chitral, the Nari or Narsati villages, to Umra Khan, in 1892. "The miraculous readiness of the commissariat, not to speak of the silent and sudden readiness of 18,000 men," and the promptness of the start of the expedition, all point in the same direction. As Dr. Leitner plainly says, "only the credulous can contend that we entered on the expedition without long and carefully-planned preparations, or simply because we were suddenly called upon to rescue Robertson, who had no business at all to be interned in Chitral." The whole policy is disastrous in every respect, and is bound to bring upon us eventual retribution."—*Daily Chronicle*, October 3.

INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

It is high time that public attention in this country was directed to the apparently concerted attempts on the part of several Governments in South Africa to impose certain restrictions—which are not only offensive in themselves, but grievously damaging in their material consequences—upon British Indian subjects. The main facts, which are with difficulty to be obtained from a voluminous collection of memorials, private and official correspondence, and Blue-books, were recently laid before Mr. Chamberlain at the Colonial Office by a representative Indian deputation of Hindus, Muhammadans, and Parsís, organised by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress. The deputation was introduced by the Grand Old Man of India, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, whose wishes and opinions were ably supported by the well-known Calcutta barrister, Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee. Mr. Chamberlain's reply was, so far as it went, sympathetic and encouraging. But it did not go far enough. The restrictions which have been, or are being, imposed upon British Indian subjects in South Africa are restrictions upon the possession of the franchise, the acquisition of real property, freedom of locomotion, and of choice of places of residence and places of business, and the enjoyment of trade licenses. The area which is concerned includes Natal, Cape Colony, the Transvaal, and the Orange Free State. And, indeed, later information goes to show that in Mashonaland also, from the end of the present year onwards, the Chartered Company proposes not only to grant no new trade licenses to Indians but actually to refuse the renewal of such licenses to Indian traders who, with their families, have been settled in the country for a considerable period. Now, Mr. Chamberlain's reply to the Congress deputation was sadly incomplete. "Your claims and your requests have," he said, "my most sympathetic consideration." And, again: "You may be sure that whatever influence I do possess will be exercised in your favour." But in his detailed examination of the grievances that were brought before him he omitted all reference to the Orange Free State, while in respect of Natal, Cape Colony, and the Transvaal he concerned himself with only one restriction instead of five. It is to be hoped that, since that time, Mr. Chamberlain has given further attention to the subject, and that when Parliament reassembles diligent enquiry will be made as to the steps which he has taken.

We have not the space to examine fully a matter which, while its general bearings are clear and simple enough, is undoubtedly complex and intricate in detail. In Cape Colony our Indian fellow-subjects are disfranchised, not by name, but by provisions which, not accidentally, operate chiefly to exclude them. Mr. Chamberlain's words lead us to hope, and to believe, that he will endeavour to secure the withdrawal of this odious racial distinction. In Natal, on the other hand, it is proposed that Indians as such shall be expressly disfranchised. Here Mr. Chamberlain suggested, as was to be expected, that he will disallow the measure. In the case of the Transvaal, the matter to which Mr. Chamberlain addressed himself was the requirement that Indians, ostensibly for sanitary reasons but really for commercial reasons, should reside only in separate locations. The matter is complicated by a so-called arbitration. But the award proves, on examination, to have been no award at all. The arbitrator left open precisely the question which he had been invited to determine. Mr. Chamberlain promised to make, and if needs were to repeat, representations to the Government of the Transvaal with a view of restoring to Indian residents the freedom which they can claim. These particulars are enough to throw light upon the hateful persecution to which British Indian subjects are being subjected. The new Indian Immigration Law Amendment Bill, which virtually proposes to reduce Indians to a state of slavery, is another example. The thing is a monstrous wrong, an insult to British subjects, a disgrace to its authors, and a slight upon ourselves. Every Englishman is concerned to see that the commercial greed of the South African trader is not permitted to wreak such bitter injustice upon men who, alike by proclamation and by statute, are placed upon an equality with ourselves before the law.—*The Star*, October 21.

THE JURY BILL.

The *Hindu* (Madras) of September 23rd writes:—One has but to carefully read the new Jury Bill to be convinced of the great changes that are sought to be effected in the practice of trial by jury in India, changes which are so thoroughly destructive of the institution as it now exists that we shall be left merely with the name, which nobody loses anything by retaining. Section 303 of the Criminal Procedure Code, which now consists of five or six lines, is to be displaced by another of considerable magnitude, consisting of five sub-sections, each bigger than the original section. The first sub-section says that the jury shall be at liberty to return a general verdict of "guilty" or "not guilty," except in the cases mentioned in the succeeding sub-sections. The effect of the section is that the jury shall be at liberty to return a general verdict, only if the judge does not direct them to return special verdicts; and even after a general verdict is returned, it shall be open to the judge, if he be in doubt whether he should or not express disagreement, to require the jury further to return a special verdict on any question of fact on which he may desire their opinion, and after the receipt of such special verdict finally to determine whether to agree or disagree with the general verdict of the jury. Again, sub-section 4 says that after a special verdict has been returned, if the judge requires any further information on any particular questions of fact to enable him to determine whether to express agreement or disagreement with such verdict, or whether such verdict amounts to one of acquittal or conviction, he may require the jury to return a further special verdict as to such questions of fact, and after the receipt of such further verdict he shall finally determine whether to express agreement or disagreement with the jury, or whether the verdict is to be recorded as a verdict of acquittal or conviction, as the case may be. In other words, the judge is to determine what the general verdict should be, whether it should be one of acquittal or conviction, after ascertaining the opinions of the jury on particular questions of fact involved in the case. It may even happen that the verdict which the judge deduces from the opinions given by the jury on particular questions of fact, is quite opposed to the conclusion which the jury themselves have come to in their minds. Thus, while the jury is for an acquittal, the judge may deduce from the special verdicts a verdict for conviction, and *vice versa*. . . . . While the jury is of opinion that the man is guilty, the judge can find from special verdicts that he is not. But if for some reason or other the judge should find it difficult to reverse the actual verdict of the jury by means of special verdicts, he is asked to refer it to the High Court, and the latter tribunal is directed that it shall consider the entire evidence, and giving due weight to the opinions of the judge and the jury, uphold or reverse the verdict. The tendency of the whole thing, as we have pointed out above, is that the jury's verdict shall have no finality whatever, except at the option of the judge; and the High Court's power of interference which is purely discretionary under the present Code, is rendered mandatory by the amendment, as though the executive Government has no confidence in the High Court that it will do its duty properly if left to its own discretion; for the only justification for this change is that the High Court has not properly used its discretion hitherto, and that it is therefore necessary to compel it to do its duty. We hesitate to believe that Sir Alexander Miller is capable of such a deep-laid policy as is apparent in this Jury Bill; and we should be glad to know that some person other than the revered legal member has contributed his talents liberally to plan this legislation. The jury may return a general or special verdict at the discretion of the judge. If the latter does not agree, he may subject them to a severe cross-examination, make them contradict themselves and stultify their original verdict or verdicts, and thereupon frame his own even against the actual opinion of the jury. If his cleverness in cross-examining fails to shake the jury and to bring about a contrary verdict, he can still hope to have the verdict set aside by a reference to the High Court. Yet the name "jury" is retained, as a concession to popular sentiment, because barbarians in England regard trial by jury as a fetish although Sir Alexander Miller, with all his legal lore, is not convinced that the jury is better than the judge to arrive at a correct conclusion on questions of fact!

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1895.

SIR CHARLES ELLIOTT'S ADMINISTRATION OF BENGAL.

BY PARBATI C. ROY, B.A.

Sometime Member of the Bengal Uncovenanted Service.

Sir Charles Elliott assumed charge of the Lieutenant-Governorship of Bengal on December 17th, 1890, so that in the usual course of things his reign at Belvedere will come to its close before the end of the present year. An examination of the results of his administration is therefore not premature.

Sir C. Elliott had done some good work in Assam as Chief Commissioner, and when he came to Bengal from his last appointment as financial member of the Viceregal Council, he met with a cordial reception from all classes of the people. It soon became evident, however, that the very qualifications which had made him a successful ruler in Assam, where the inhabitants for the most part are uneducated and unenlightened, made him unfit for the Governorship of the most advanced province of India. Sir C. Elliott is nothing if not an autocrat of autocrats. He does not lack sympathy for those placed under him. But they must not think for themselves, they must accept his edicts. Sir C. Elliott holds a high opinion of his own powers and expects others to do the same. That great quality of receiving criticisms with calmness and equanimity which characterised his predecessors is wanting in him. He forgets that an iron rule, not tempered with justice and moderation, is the worst possible rule that a country can have. During his administration there have been many complaints of high-handedness and illegalities on the part of his civilian "prefects," but not in a single instance was the delinquent punished for his vagaries, though even the High Court strongly commented on their conduct. In Sir C. Elliott's opinion, the members of the Civil Service must be strongly supported under all circumstances, for the people would otherwise be apt to think lightly of their rulers.

Sir Charles Elliott might have made a good Governor at the commencement of British rule in India when there were few laws and few law-courts. But in these advanced days he is an anachronism. He is reported to have said to a correspondent of *Black and White*:—

> "Till I came to Bengal I never occupied a position where I was not regarded as the *Ma-Bap*, the mother or father of the people. But here in Bengal dwells the educated Babu, who, with brilliant exceptions, is as a rule discontented and disloyal."

It would appear from the above that Sir C. Elliott is the person sinned against, and that the "educated Babu" is the sinner. I shall try to show, from the information supplied in reports issued by Sir C. Elliott himself, how far he is justified in making the accusation.

Sir C. Elliott has in the first place infused a greater zeal for conviction in criminal cases amongst his subordinates. In 1890-91, the first year of his rule, the percentage of convictions in police cases was 50·4, in 1891-92 it rose to 52·2, in 1892-93 it rose still higher, namely, to 58·4. It was 57 in 1893-94. A similar increase in convictions will be found in other cases. That the sentences of the criminal courts during Sir C. Elliott's government gave less satisfaction to the people will appear from the fact that, while the number of applications made to the High Court against these sentences was 3,622 in 1890-91, it rose to 4316 in 1893-94: and that while in the former year the number of cases in which judgments were reversed was 609, in the latter year it rose to 756. A like increase is visible in the number of cases in which further enquiries were ordered. From 137 in 1890-91 these enquiries rose to 291 in 1893-94. Nothing can be more condemnatory than the above figures of the hasty procedure in the trial of criminal cases which was inaugurated by Sir C. Elliott and worked out by the District Magistrates. Should an enquiry be held into the undue influence exercised by District Magistrates on the poor Deputy Magistrates who are entirely at their mercy, it will bring to light most startling facts. I give below instances of how Mr. B., District Magistrate of the 24 Parganahs, terrorised over me during the short period of my work under him at Alipur. The other Deputy Magistrates serving under him at Alipur at that time will bear testimony to similar treatment at the hands of this model "prefect" of Sir C. Elliott's. But it is not Mr. B. that is to blame for his conduct. The blame rests entirely with Sir C. Elliott, whose guiding influence has created many more District Magistrates of a similar type.

> "Case No. 1.
>
> "PARBATI BO.,
>
> "If the facts found by you are correct the sentence passed is utterly inadequate. Government has expressly directed that when an accused person is convicted of bringing

a false charge (except in exceptional circumstances) he shall be punished severely. The sentence you have passed is not more than the complainant would have received had the charge of theft been true. It should have been at least four times as much. I am very much dissatisfied at this, and so will the L.-G. if the case comes before him. What explanation have you to offer?

"16/1/92. "(Sd.) E. N. B."

"I do not consider the sentence (six months) to be at all inadequate. I have awarded what I considered to be the proper punishment. The accused charged the complainant with the theft of a *garu* (brass jug), valued at Rs. 1-4, for which the punishment might have been two weeks.

"16/1/92. "(Sd.) P. C. R."

"PARBATI Bo.,

"The sentence is utterly inadequate. If this occurs again, I shall report your misconduct to Government. The tone of your remarks is also insubordinate and improper. Please clearly understand that I shall not tolerate this kind of thing for a moment.

"18/1/92. "(Sd.) E. N. B."

After what took place in this case Mr. B. never lost an opportunity to make unfavourable remarks against my decisions.

The two cases given below will speak for themselves:—

"Case No. 2.

"PARBATI Bo.,

"You told me yesterday that there were reasons for the delay in this case. I find no reasons whatever on the record.

"The delay from the 5th to 14th is much too long.

"Why were not arguments heard on the same day?

"Why was the application of the first party acceded to?

"You do not seem to understand the necessity of disposing of these cases at the earliest possible date.

"Very bad.

"(Sd.) E. N. B."

"Case No. 3.

"PARBATI Bo.,

"In this case the right of cross-examination seems to have been abused. You must check this.

"3/4/92. "(Sd.) E. B."

"PARBATI Bo.,

"This is a most inadequate and unsuitable sentence. The constable was wantonly assaulted without provocation in the discharge of his duties, and you say that the offence is not at all a serious one. Why not? The accused should have been sentenced to two months' rigorous imprisonment. Your judgment is careless and slovenly, and does not state the facts. If it were not that you are about to retire, I should hand the case up to Government as a specimen of inefficiency.

"(Sd.) B."

"As I have said, the injuries were slight, and considering the age (20) of the accused, and the circumstance that the assault was not a premeditated one, I awarded fine and not imprisonment.

"I have no objection to the magistrate of the district handing this or any other case of mine to Government. It is not certain that I shall soon retire.

"12/4/92. "(Sd.) P. C. ROY."

Owing to ill-health I was compelled to take furlough for coming to England. Mr. B. had previously given me permission to make over charge on April 14th, 1892. But after what passed between him and me on April 12th in the case last quoted, he changed his mind and ordered me, by way of punishment, not to make over charge on that day but on the following day which was a holiday, and to go to a station in the interior which was inaccessible by railway, and the journey to which was to be performed by boat through swampy lands. The following correspondence took place on the subject:—

"BABU PARBATI CH. ROY,

"Please do not make over charge until to-morrow afternoon.

"Can you conveniently arrange to go out to Bhangor Thana to-morrow morning early to superintend the payment of *Chowkidars?*

"14/4/92. "(Sd.) E. N. B."

"I have been of late suffering very much from diabetes, and I regret I cannot go to Bhangor to-morrow. I hope the magistrate of the district will permit me to make over charge this afternoon.

"14/4/92. "(Sd.) P. C. R."

"No. The Government order upsets this.

"(Sd.) E. N. B."

"Agreeably to the magistrate's previous order, arrangement has been made, and Babu Shamadhal Roy has commenced cases which could not be finished by me.

"14/4/92. "(Sd.) P. C. ROY."

"You will have to go to Bhangor unless Bd. Shamadhal Roy can go.

"(Sd.) E. N. B."

"Babu Shamadhal Roy is willing to go, and I hope the magistrate will kindly excuse me in consideration of my ill-health.

"14/4/92. "(Sd.) P. C. ROY."

"Very well.

"14/4/92. "(Sd.) E. N. B."

It will be seen that the ground at first taken up by Mr. B. that the Government orders were against my making over charge on April 14th, was not the real ground, as he at last allowed me to make over charge on that day. Bengal will soon be relieved of Sir C. Elliott, but the terrorism introduced by him will continue to work as long as the spirit of the administration remains unchanged.

The second point noticeable in the administration of Sir Charles Elliott is his attempt to reduce the jury to the level of assessors. The English Government, with its instinctive sense of justice, introduced the system of trial by jury in some of the districts of Bengal when it passed the new Criminal Procedure Code. Sir C. Elliott, with his desire for increased convictions, came to the conclusion, without any proper enquiry, that the "Native jury had failed to do their duty." In his opinion "the evils were so great that if the result could have been foreseen no advocate could be found for the introduction of this Western institution in India." The Commission appointed under orders of the Secretary of State to enquire into the matter, however, arrived at a different conclusion, and Sir Charles was checkmated. It will not be out of place to give here the results of trial by jury during the last four years.

In 1890-91, the number of cases in which the judges agreed with the jury was 315; the number of cases in which they wholly disagreed was 33, and the number in which they partially disagreed was 22. In 1891-92, the figures under the above heads were 333, 33, and 17 respectively. In 1892-93 they were 389, 18, and 12, and in 1893-94, 1086, 25, and 16. It will be seen from these figures that the number of cases in which the judges wholly, or partially, disagreed was never considerable, and that these disagreements are decreasing every year. So keen an observer as Sir Charles Elliott could not have failed to notice that not a year passes without cases in which Europeans are charged with the offence of murdering Bengalis. During the four years 1890-91 to 1893-94, there were as many as 14 cases of murder (described in the reports as offences against life) against Europeans and in not a single case was the offender found guilty of murder. In only three cases the convictions were by the District Magistrate which means for a minor offence. In the rest of the cases the accused were acquitted.

The European jury have invariably acquitted their countrymen. In some of these cases the verdicts of the jury were so flagrantly unjust that the judges of the High Court wept over them. One would have expected that Sir Charles Elliott, while dealing with the "Native" jury, would have dealt with the European jury as well. He did no such thing, and thereby alienated the sympathy of the "Natives." No impartial judge will, after this, for a moment contend that "Native" jurors are worse than European jurors.

Sir Charles Elliott's partiality towards Europeans is visible also in other directions.

(1) During his government there were two cases of bribery against judicial officers—one against a "native" and the other against a European. In the case of the former there was a summary dismissal. In the case of the latter a much too prolonged enquiry (first by the District Magistrate judicially, and then by a Commission) was made before the delinquent was dismissed from the Service.

(2) In order to better the condition of the poor "Whites," Sir Charles Elliott recommended the creation of a special regiment for their employment, but he had no recommendations to make for bettering the condition of the poor "Blacks" of the "Bhadraloke" or gentlemen castes, many of whom suffer from abject poverty and destitution. Like the poor "Whites" they cannot work as coolies or labouring men. In his orders for the appointment of village *Chowkidars* he at first insisted that they should not be appointed from the low castes, but soon found out that the high castes would not accept such appointments. Like the poor "Whites" they would rather die from starvation than serve as porters and village watchmen. The problem of the day in India is not how to find employment for the working-men, but for those who saw better days before, but have been stricken with poverty and forced to live on one meal a day under British Rule, which has upset previous social arrangements. In times of scarcity and famine they are the first to fall victims, but they, like the poor "Whites," would much sooner die from starvation than take up manual labour. The two cases are similar, and a Governor who favours one race and disregards the other cannot but be charged with partiality.

(3) During Sir Charles Elliott's rule, the Government grant for education has steadily decreased. He began with a total Government grant of Rs. 22,26,377 in 1890-91, and reduced it to Rs. 20,24,000 in 1893-94[1] while on the other hand he raised the grant for European education from Rs. 1,65,302 in 1890-91 to Rs. 1,82,906 in 1893-94. Seeing that the number of schools for the education of Europeans is about 70, and that for the education of Indians 53,000, there can be no justification for spending one-tenth of the Government funds on the former.

During Sir Charles Elliott's administration the orders creating an Imperial and a Provincial Service were passed and certain proportions of District-Magistracies, Collectorships, and Judgeships were set apart for the members of the Provincial Service recruited mostly from amongst "natives." Although more than two years have passed since the promulgation of these orders not a single "native" has been raised to a District-Judgeship or a District-Collectorship from the Provincial Service. Probably, as Sir Charles is reported to have said to the correspondent of *Black and White*:—

> "Where the danger lies is in the employment of Natives, who, as soon as they are put into positions of authority, are apt to let things slide, and who are absolutely without power of initiative, and who can only slavishly copy the Englishman. The Natives make good *employés*, but, as a rule, they fail in positions of responsibility."

But Sir Charles ignored the facts that the "Natives" who entered the Civil Service after passing competitive examinations held in England or statutory examinations held in Bengal have proved fit for the posts of Districts Judges and Magistrates. Some of the latter were members of the subordinate Judicial and Executive services before they became statutory civilians. Surely if Sir Charles Elliott had had his wish in the matter he would have given opportunities for the Subordinate Judges and Deputy Magistrates to prove their fitness for the posts lately thrown open to them.

Whilst thus withholding from the "Natives" the higher appointments thrown open to them by Her Majesty's Government, Sir C. Elliott has by vesting the Sub-Deputy Collectors with criminal powers created a class of Judiciaries on low pay. In his opinion this scheme has worked wonderfully well. The "educated Babu," in spite of what Sir Charles Elliott may think of him, is most intelligent, and often a bench clerk to a Magistrate could try petty criminal cases just as well as the Magistrate himself. The legitimate issue of the policy inaugurated by Sir Charles would be the employment of Magistrates on as low salaries as would secure the services of educated Babus. Considering the number of B.A's and M.A's annually turned out from the university the market value of such a person would not be more than Rs. 25 or at the most Rs. 50. Why should Sir Charles Elliott stop at the Sub-Deputy Collectors and not come down to *Kanoongoes* on Rs. 25 and Rs. 50 and vest them with Magisterial powers? There was a time when the *Munsiffs* (the lowest grade of Civil Judges) were paid by commission. Afterwards their initial salaries were fixed at Rs. 100; but this, too, was considered inadequate remuneration for a judicial officer and so they were raised to the same status as the Deputy Magistrates. The retrograde policy of Sir Charles Elliott has virtually reduced the Deputy Magistrates to the level that the *Munsiffs* occupied thirty years ago. This is practising economy with a vengeance. Sir

---

[1] "Statistical Abstract Relating to British India," No. 27, p. 194. "Report on the Administration of Bengal for 1893-94," p. 325.

Charles Elliott might, like the late Lord Lawrence, have begun his economical scheme by reducing his own pay. A Commissioner, as a pro-Consul, rules over a division on Rs. 2,900 a month. He would make as good a Lieutenant-Governor on Rs. 5,000, as Sir Charles Elliott on Rs. 8,333. The fact is that all civilized Governments pay their Judicial and Executive officers such salaries as would not only attract able and efficient men but place them above all temptations. In India especially the the respectability attached to a post is in proportion to the salary attached to it. Magisterial officers on Rs. 100 are looked down upon by the people and command no respect.

All previous Lieutenant-Governors insisted on the prompt decision of cases, but none of them laid the delay to the account of the dilatoriness of the trying magistrates.

It would appear from the remarks in the Administration Report for 1892-93, and from the communication made to the correspondent of *Black and White*, that in the opinion of Sir Charles Elliott the magistrates, most of whom were Indians, did not work after the "so-called office-hours," and so he insisted on their showing better results. As, owing to the great increase in criminal cases of late years, the Native magistrates were already overworked, and in most cases sat "after the so-called office hours," the effect of the new orders was to increase the burden of the already heavily laden Deputy Magistrates. The "Native" press, which knew the real facts better than Sir Charles Elliott, took up the case of the Deputy Magistrates and found fault with the Lieutenant-Governor's orders. This was an offence which Sir Charles Elliott could not forgive, and he complained about it to his friend the correspondent of *Black and White*. Had Sir Charles Elliott taken the increase in work into consideration and accompanied his orders for the speedy disposal of cases with an increase in the number of Deputy Magistrates, the Native press would have appreciated his love of justice. But, as he did no such thing, they were justified in saying that the effect of these orders on the health of the Deputy Magistrates would be disastrous.

For the above and other reasons the "Native" press failed to appreciate Sir Charles Elliott's love for their countrymen. This was an unpardonable offence, and so he abuses the Native press as being "disloyal and seditious."

In the opinion of Sir Charles Elliott "men like Mr. W. S. Caine, however well-intentioned they may be, are nevertheless the most dangerous to the Empire." "Mark my words," says Sir Charles Elliott, "if India is to be lost it will be on the floor of the House of Commons." But with all deference to Sir Charles Elliott I venture to urge for the consideration of his countrymen whether men like him and not Stansfelds, Wedderburns, and Caines, are the worst enemies to the British Empire in India. The former would rule India with an iron hand, and drive the "Natives" to resort to Nihilistic measures, while the latter would rule them with the golden chains of love and fellowship, and thereby effect a lasting union between Indians and Englishmen.

Parbati C. Roy.

ENTRANCE TO THE CIVIL SERVICE.

By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.

Last month there was printed in these columns the list of successful candidates for sixty-six vacancies at the recent competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service. As was then pointed out, the list of marks gained by the several candidates is strikingly suggestive. The first man appears to be exceptional. He makes very nearly one-third more marks than the second, and considerably more than twice as many marks as a recent senior wrangler, who is about half-way down the list. The first man has 3,738 marks; the last man, 1,493. Does this notable difference in the examination results really represent a like difference in the service value of the men? Take the first man, a middle man—say the senior wrangler—and the last man: are the positions of these in the least indicative of their comparative chances of a Lieutenant-Governorship, or of performing important service to India and the Empire? It is not easy to believe that. But the degree of distrust measures the degree of inadequacy of these examinations as a test of selection. Of course, the question is a very complicated and a very difficult one. It is necessary to apply non-examinational tests. But what shall they be, and who shall apply them? One other characteristic of the list is lamentable to note: there is but one native Indian name, Sheik Ashgar Ali, among the sixty-six. It is certainly no rash affirmation to say that this proportion grossly misrepresents the ability and capacities of the native youth, and signalises a grievous injustice which is bitterly resented in India.

No one, of course, will complain of the exclusion of Indian candidates on the mere ground of their failure to conquer the necessary position in the examination results. That would be too preposterous, even for a foolish Babu. The test is there, and it must obviously stand for one candidate as for another. The monstrous inequality emerges in the compulsion of Indian candidates to come all the way to England in order to sit for the examination. How many of the successful English candidates, one may ask, would have appeared in the recent lists if the examinations had been held in Calcutta, or Allahabad, or Bombay, or Madras? The point is no new one; it is obvious on the very face of the facts. It was taken by Lord Stanley (afterwards the great Lord Derby) on a similar question in 1853—more than forty years ago. What said Lord Stanley?

> "Suppose," he said, "that instead of holding those examinations here in London, they were to be held in Calcutta. Well, how many Englishmen would go out there, or how many would send out their sons, perhaps to spend two or three years in the country on the chance of obtaining an appointment! Nevertheless, that is exactly the course proposed to be adopted towards the natives of India."

It is the course that is actually in operation, preposterous and unjust as it manifestly is. The expenditure of time and money on the off-chance of success in a contest otherwise by no means equal, constitutes inevitably a most formidable deterrent, limiting painfully the area of selection from the best of the native youth. "It seems a mockery," Sir Stafford Northcote, as Secretary for India, once wrote, "to tell them to come and compete at Westminster if they like." Yet, nearly half a century after Lord Stanley spoke, and more than a quarter of a century after Sir Stafford wrote, the "mockery" is continued in full force. Even in the teeth of a Resolution adopted by the House of Commons and at first accepted with apparent frankness by the Government of the day, the "mockery" still flourishes. Nay, the insistence of obstructive officialism at Calcutta and in the India Council even bent the courage of a Liberal Government, and nullified the intentions of the House of Commons. If the grounds of such recalcitrancy displayed any basis of sound reason, there might be cause for patient endurance. But, so far as can be seen, it appears to be the mere perversity of unreasoning prejudice and high-handedness.

The arguments marshalled in the speeches of Mr. Paul, Mr. Naoroji, and Sir William Wedderburn, in support of Mr. Paul's motion in the House were not answered at the time. They have not been answered since. They are, in fact, unanswerable. Mr. George Russell, speaking for the Government, practically abandoned the objections formulated by Sir Charles Aitchison's Commission of 1887 — objections not merely untenable but puerile. They are "but dust in the balance," he said, "as compared with the great fundamental racial difficulty." But that difficulty itself, although a real difficulty, is but as dust in the balance as compared with the burden that lies upon England to be true to her promises, and to be just and honourable in her dealings with the people of India. There is no necessity whatever for the employment of natives in any part of India where they would not be acceptable to the population. Surely it is not beyond the power of statesmanship to devise regulations that would obviate all possible objection on that score. The point of "the great fundamental racial difficulty" is, in fact, too humiliating for argument; it is merely a polite form of negation. Besides, it is not to be forgotten that the Aitchison Commission acknowledged that those Indians who had reached high administrative posts had discharged their duties with satisfaction to their superiors and to those with whom they had to deal. To-day it would be impossible for an official report to state any other conclusion. If, then, this most important element in the case is to receive its due weight, what more need be said? Why, the very opponents of a system of Simultaneous Examinations point out that natives have free scope to rise to the highest posts in the country through the Provincial system. If such a free career is open to them by the one route, why should it not be open to them by the other? In neither case does promotion depend upon the mere mode of entrance into the Service. Sir Henry Fowler, quite recently, admitted that "Her Majesty's Government are most anxious that the natives of India should enjoy every facility compatible with the maintenance of the efficiency of the administration and the safety of the British rule, to enter the Public Service." So far as words go, no Indian could desire a fuller or franker acknowledgment. But when it comes to putting words in action, Sir Henry finds insuperable objections to the establishment of Simultaneous Examinations. What are these objections? He leaves them unstated, and without indication as to where they can be found. "By far the best method," he said, "of meeting the legitimate claims and aspirations of the natives of the country, is to bestow such of the higher posts as can be made available for them on those who distinguish themselves by their capacity and trustworthiness in the performance of subordinate duties." Again, it must be pointed out that this is exactly the method of promotion in the Civil Service, and that it cannot matter two straws by which door the native that deserves promotion has entered the service of the Government. The distinction thus drawn by Sir Henry Fowler is wholly unworthy and futile.

It is worth while to recall another of Mr. George Russell's points, which serves to indicate how hopelessly barren of argument the hard-pressed official finds himself. "When a young Indian gentleman is willing to come over to England; when he is willing to make this change in his life and habits; when he is willing to leave his home, his friends, and the society of his people; when he is willing to submit himself to instruction in this country, and to take his chance in free and open competition with Englishmen, he gives unmistakeable proof that he is a picked and marked man, that he has qualifications and self-reliance which will make him a valuable public servant, a man whose admission into the Indian Service we can regard with satisfaction and hope." This rigmarole, one must believe, left a very bitter taste in Mr. Russell's mouth. He cannot but have been haunted with the cruel reflection that the English candidates are not subjected to these interesting tests. If the Indian proves himself a worthy man by coming to the examination in London, why not require the Englishmen to exhibit similar proof of their worth by expatriating themselves for examination in India? But, after all, what does the test come to? It means neither more nor less than so much expense. How much can you plank down? The virtue of the Indian candidate depends solely upon his father's possession of the necessary number of spare rupees. The argument shows a very melancholy result, of which no one, probably is more ashamed than Mr. Russell himself.

If there is one fact more firmly established than another in respect of the English government of India, it is the fact that our officials are dangerously out of touch with native sentiment and opinion. That being so, it might have been supposed that the Government would be anxious to discover the best native talent and bind it to their service by honourable appreciation. No one is disposed to question the necessity of putting the civilians of native birth through a considerable course of English experience in England. But this can be done perfectly well after the preliminary selection and before their appointment to their first post. Once a candidate's future is practically assured, on conditions of satisfactory conduct and progress in his studies, the expenditure of time and money involved in a two years' sojourn in England would have a reasonable basis of justification. It would proceed on a moral certainty, and not, as now, on an utterly vague chance. But, in this connexion, another point of Sir Stafford Northcote's still remains "worthy of consideration," as he thought it in 1867; and that is, not only "whether a certain number of appointments should be given by competitive examination in India itself," but whether the successful candidates at such examinations should not "be sent over at the expense of the Government to complete their education." The real object of the examinations ought to be to get the best men, not of a narrow moneyed class, but of the whole population; and if we are to draw upon the full strength of Indian capability, it seems to be essential that the Government undertake the expense, or a substantial portion of the expense, of the selected candidates' two years' stay in England for study and social experience.

The impression left by the whole case for Simultaneous Examinations, historically considered, tends to induce agreement for once with Lord Lytton. In the debate on Mr. Paul's motion, Mr. Naoroji quoted from a confidential minute of Lord Lytton's the following candid passage:—

> "The application to natives of the competitive examination system as conducted in England, and the recent reduction in the age at which candidates can compete, are all so many deliberate and transparent subterfuges for stultifying the Act and reducing it to a dead letter. Since I am writing confidentially, I do not hesitate to say that both the Governments of England and of India appear to me up to the present moment unable to answer satisfactorily the charge of having taken every means in their power of breaking to the heart the words of promise they uttered to the ear."

It is all very well for Mr. Naoroji, with indefeasible Indian politeness, to qualify Lord Lytton's charges. The effect upon the Indian mind cannot be very different from the view expressed by Lord Lytton. It is a most unhappy situation, and the friends of India are bound to labour strenuously and continuously till the injustice has been finally removed.

A. F. Murison.

THE SCOPE OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

By H. N. Haridas, F.I.In., M.S.A.,
Secretary to the Surat Congress Committee.

The attempts of those who are responsible for the good government of India to evade and obstruct independent enquiry into their administration proves the necessity of keeping a strict watch in the House of Commons over the suicidal policy that is now being pursued in India and countenanced by the authorities in London. In their attempts to screen the absurdity of transactions entered into by the authorities in India, the authorities at home forget that they are apt to make themselves ridiculous. Otherwise we should not be scandalised by hearing a responsible statesman from his seat in the House of Commons admit, in reply to Sir W. Wedderburn's plain question about extensions of Her Majesty's Indian possessions subsequent to 1858, that "the information necessary for giving a complete answer to the hon. member's question does not exist in this country."[1] What is still more curious is the admission that "no official maps are in existence to show the external frontiers of Her Majesty's Indian possessions with reference to sec. 55 of the Act for the better government of India."[2]

Does the Secretary of State for India mean seriously that the authorities who control Indian affairs from this country do not in fact possess either a map, as intended by sec. 55 of the Act of 1858, or any other means of knowing correctly the extent of the territories placed under their charge? But for these statements made in the House of Commons, it would be impossible even to imagine such a state of affairs. It is on this hypothesis that we can understand the conflict between the views of the present and the past Secretaries of State for India as to whether Chitral is within or without the external frontiers of India, as defined by the Act of 1858. Lord George Hamilton admits that "the Secretarys of State for India and the Government of India cannot use the troops of India beyond the boundaries of India without statutory permission."[3] Believing with Sir H. Fowler that Chitral is beyond the external frontiers of India, I do not understand, and I do not think that those who are not initiated in the secrets of esoteric officialdom can ever understand, on what data the Secretary of State for India and his subordinates decide whether expenditure on certain military operations is chargeable legally on the revenues of India, or statutory consent is necessary under the law. Strange indeed it seems to the ordinary intellect, this groping in the dark—this "blind leading the blind."

The debates and answers to questions in Parliament, to which I have referred, make it clear that if there is not an ignorance of the real extent of India, there is at least a divergence of opinion as to what is India under the Act of 1858. It behoves the members of the Royal Commission, therefore, to decide that point first, and then to decide any other points that may be placed before it. Can they do it? I think they can do it, and they are bound to do it. The Commission has been directed to enquire into the administration of expenditure incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India.[4] Neither the Secretary of State for India, who owes his creation and authority to a statute only, and neither to constitutional tradition nor to the common law, has power to charge the Indian revenues save for the purposes of the Government of "India" as defined by Act of 1858, and under the restrictions prescribed in that Act. The Royal Commission is independent of the Secretary of State for India, and it is itself to decide what authority it has. The Secretary of State has no control over its actions. In fact, he cannot legally interfere. Nor are the members of the Royal Commission concerned with any statements that the Secretary of State may have made in the House of Commons. Such statements do not affect them at all. They derive their authority from the Royal Proclamation appointing them, and they have to construe the Proclamation from what is in the Proclamation itself. They are to construe it as judges who are called upon to interpret a part of a statute, and the rule of law, that what may be called the parliamentary history of an enactment is not admissible to explain its meaning,[1] necessarily puts out of court any remarks which the Secretary of State may have made with regard to the scope of the enquiry. The Proclamation invests the members of the Commission with an authority and a discretion which are to be regulated by acknowledged principles of law.[2] The Commissioners, holding quasi-judicial functions, must be under the ruling that applies to tribunals to whose discretion the law leaves something that is to be done. The Commission will, therefore, take into consideration all that can enable it, directly or indirectly, to come to a conclusion as to whether the "administration" and "management" of so-called Indian expenditure have been *intra vires* and legal—in other words, whether the money spent has been spent for the purposes indicated in the Statute, and, if so spent, whether it has been spent judiciously so as to secure in the best way the object in view. Consequently a power to enquire into the real extent of territories which in law should be regarded as India (involving, of course, an enquiry into additions subsequent to 1858), the capacity of the Government of India to enter into certain transactions, and the wisdom, *bona fides*, and necessity of those transactions is necessary to the proper discharge of the discretion vested in the Commissioners by the Proclamation. It may be objected that the Commission cannot enquire into the question of necessity. The answer is that, according to Statute,[3] the revenue of India is chargeable for the Government of India alone. If there is no necessity, there cannot be any purpose within the purview of the Act; hence any money spent unnecessarily would be spent illegally and without authority. Such an enquiry being essential, the power to institute it is, by implication, granted to the Commissioners. The rule of law in such cases is,[4] "Whenever anything is authorised, and especially if, as a matter of duty, required to be done by law, and it is found impossible to do that thing unless something else not authorised in express terms be also done, then that something else will be supplied by necessary intendment." The maxim of law, "*Quando lex aliquid concedit, concedere videtur et illud sine quo res ipsa esse non potest,*" applies in this case. With all due deference, therefore, to statements made in the House of Commons I maintain that this is an enquiry into Indian "affairs" whether the Gods on the summit of the Indian Olympus smile or thunder. To follow the same argument to its logical conclusion, the Commission can, I imagine, enquire whether the expenditure is in excess of income and whether the system of management of the expenditure does or does not impoverish permanently the sources of income, endanger future income, and make it, perhaps, impossible to meet future expenditure. The Commission being also empowered to "call for and have access to and examine, all such books documents, registers and records as may afford" the fullest information on the subject,[1] can insist upon all such information from whatever quarter it pleases.

---

[1] India Supplement, July, p. 82.
[3] *Ibid.*, May, p. 57.
[2] *Ibid.*, September, p. 87.
[4] *London Gazette*, 31st May, 1895.

HARDEVRAM NANABHAI HARIDAS.

---

[1] R. *v.* Hertford College, 3 Q.B.D., 707; per Pollock, C.B. in Attorney-General *v.* Sillem, 2 H. & C., 521, and per Bramwell, B. 537.

[2] Per Lord Mansfield, in R. *v.* Wilkes, 4 Burr, 2839, and per Willes, J., in Lee *v.* Bude Ry. Co., L. R., 6 C. P. 576, at p. 580.

[3] Sec. 2 of the Act of 1858.

[4] Fenton *v.* Hampton, 11 Moo. P. C. C. 360.

THE OBSERVANCE OF THE LAW IN INDIA.

BY J. DACOSTA.

Mr. Burkitt, a member of the Indian Civil Service, having been appointed to act temporarily as a judge of the High Court of the North West Provinces, was illegally maintained in his appointment on a permanent footing. The validity of the appointment having been questioned in the suit of "Gurgaram's appeal from a sentence to transportation for life," the objection was referred to a full bench, and judgment was delivered in January last year declaring, after an exhaustive consideration of every point raised in the matter, that the appointment was *ultra vires* and illegal. The following observations recorded in that judgment indicate the very important bearings of the question involved:—

> "The object and intention of Parliament could not have been to place in the hands of the Governor-General in Council a power which would enable the Executive in India to constitute a high court of one barrister-judge and of acting judges who could, at the will of the Executive, be removed from their appointments in the high court. Any such intention would be contrary to the policy pursued by Parliament ever since the Act of Settlement became law, a policy which has secured the subjects in England against the unlawful and unauthorised acts of the Executive. Hallam, in the 'Constitutional History of England,' says:—'It had been the practice of the Stuarts to dismiss judges, without seeking any other pretence, who showed any disposition to thwart Government in political prosecutions. The general behaviour of the bench had covered it with infamy.' That the risk of the Executive seeking to set the high courts in India under its control is not illusory may be inferred from the introduction of a Bill in Parliament by one section of which, if it had been passed, an order in Council might have been made for the purpose of regulating the high courts without Parliament being consulted. Under another section of that Bill a local authority would have been invested with the discretionary power specially reserved to the Chief Justice, to select and nominate from among the judges of a high court such judge or judges as it might deem preferable for the hearing and determining particular cases in which the local authority might be interested. The intention of Parliament in framing the Acts under which the high courts were constituted must have been to establish judicial tribunals which command the respect of the people of the country, and which would not be liable to any possibility or suggestion of influence on the part of the Executive."

Nevertheless the Secretary of State maintained the illegal appointment, and caused it to be announced in the *London Gazette*, thereby setting at defiance and exposing to public contempt the highest judicial authority in the land, and the Act of Parliament by which that authority was established.

A dangerous situation has thus been created, which is seriously aggravated by the motive which led to its creation—namely the enforcement of arbitrary demands by the Executive. The following cases, among the many which have occurred since High Courts were established in India, place that motive beyond the possibility of doubt.

---

[1] *London Gazette*, 31st May, 1895.

In the Singampatti estate case in Madras a judgment of the Privy Council dated November 21, 1891, ordered the restoration to their rightful owner of forty-eight square miles of mountain country which the Government of India had appropriated while they had charge of the estate on trust during the owner's minority.

In the Bhaunundpur case in Behar a judgment of the Privy Council, dated February 6, 1892, likewise ordered the restoration to the rightful owners of certain arable lands in the Moughyr district, which the Government of India had arbitrarily seized as State property.

In the Kōt succession case in Bombay, a landowner having died, leaving a widow who was pregnant, the Government seized his property, real and personal, and by illegal and unworthy devices resisted the widow's claim until a judgment in her favour was delivered by the High Court of Bombay, in which the Chief Justice made the following significant remarks:—

> "I have met with no other case in the course of my long experience which bore plainer marks of falsehood and fabrication. One most extraordinary circumstance is that the judge of Ahmedabad was ordered to revoke a judicial certificate granted by the court of Ahmedabad, and that the judge was weak enough and ill-advised enough to suspend it. Furthermore, there was a hue and cry throughout the country, raised through the officers of the Government, to destroy the woman's credit in order to prevent her fighting her own and her son's battles. That was an extraordinary course for Government officers to pursue. The conduct of the Government protracted the proceedings. Judgment must go for the plaintiff, with costs."

In the Oudh case a Hindu lady named Sukraj Kuar was dispossessed of her estate on the groundless plea of disaffection to the British Government. After fourteen years of litigation, she succeeded in bringing her case before H.M. Privy Council, and the following passage in the judgment of the Judicial Committee bears testimony to the iniquitous character of the proceedings of which she had been the victim:—

> "It would be a scandal to any legislation if it arbitrarily and without any assignable reason swept away such rights; and in this very painful case it is at all events agreeable to their lordships to find that no such scandal attaches to the laws in force in Oudh, and that the cruel wrong of which this lady has been the victim is due to the misapprehension of the law by the Chief Commissioner. Their lordships cannot but express a hope that, by an act of prompt justice and a liberal estimate of what is due to this lady, the Government will relieve her from further litigation."

The Chutia Nagpur case, in which the mother of the infant Kopilnath Sahaideo sued for the recovery of his estate, which the Government of India had illegally seized, is remarkable for the suddenness with which the Government relinquished its claim as soon as an order was obtained by the plaintiff for the transfer of the trial from the provincial court, presided over by a Government servant, to the High Court of Bengal, of which Sir Barnes Peacock was Chief Justice. The following passage in a resolution which the Governor-General in Council passed with reference to this case indicates the spirit in which the law is administered in the courts where Government servants preside as judges when the Government is a party to the suit:

> "His Excellency considers that a judicial officer who exposes himself to the reflections cast on his administration by the high court must be held to have fallen short of a proper apprehension of his duty. Officers who exercise judicial powers should realise the responsibility which it throws upon them for scrupulous observance of equity in suits to which the Government they serve is a party. To strain laws to the advantage of the Government would be exactly contrary to the rule of conduct which the Government desire to impose."

These moral precepts failed entirely to arrest the evil. Nor could a different result be expected, seeing that in no instance was an officer who had violated the law in favour of the Government punished for such misdeeds, while reward not unfrequently ensued. Altogether the administration of justice forms a startling and a very sad chapter in the annals of the Government of India, and reform in the matter seems perfectly hopeless so long as the evil is encouraged by the supineness or the sanction of the Secretary of State for India.

J. Dacosta.

THE BOMBAY PROVINCIAL COUNCIL.

From a Correspondent.

The Bombay Provincial Council met at Poona on August 7th to consider the provincial Budget for the current year, 1895-96. It was the first monsoon meeting at Poona under the presidency of the new Governor, his Excellency Lord Sandhurst. It was also the first meeting after the recent elections and nominations to the Council. In these elections, while some of the old members, such as Messrs. P. M. Mehta and J. U. Yajnik were returned without opposition, and Mr. C. H. Setalwad was able to keep his seat in spite of opposition, there was an accession of new members in the persons of the Chief of Taurundwad, and Messrs. Dajī Ahajī Tuharé, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, and Mir Allabakshkhan, representing respectively the Deccan Sirdars, the newly enfranchised Central Division, and Sind. Among the nominations of new members those of the Hon. T. B. Kirkham, and the Hon. Mr. McLellan are regarded as happy. Altogether, the new Bombay Provincial Council is looked upon as a much stronger body than the old one.

The discussion on the Budget was enough to occupy the Council for two days. In fact, last year and the year before the Council spent two days upon it. This year, however, Government thought of a happy despatch by crowding two days' work into one. The result was a six hours' sitting at the end of which all members, official and non-official, seemed impatient of any more speeches. The Government members saw at once that they had barely time left them to reflect on some of the serious points raised in course of the debate, and to answer them as satisfactorily as they wished. They evidently felt the need for more time for reflexion. The debate proved conclusively that it was a move in the wrong direction to attempt to dispose of so large a subject as the annual Budget in one sitting, however prolonged it might be.

(1).—INTERPELLATIONS.

The Council having met after a long interval, the questions put ranged over a large variety of subjects. Prominent among them were those concerning the Alibag and Panwel revision settlements which had formed the theme of discussions in the press during the past four months. Questions on the Khoti settlement plainly showed that Government could no longer afford to go on without tackling the Khoti problem. As to the replies given, they showed a distinct improvement in tone, and in the desire to give information. This was specially noticeable in the replies of the Hon. Mr. Birdwood and His Excellency the President. The Hon. Mr. Birdwood showed that criticism on official replies was not thrown away upon him at all events. His replies were couched in courteous terms. It is a matter for regret that the same remark does not hold good of the replies of the Hon. Mr. Nugent. His tone and manner plainly indicated that the charges of evasiveness in Government replies could not be proved to to the hilt better than by reference to the statements made by him. To take one simple instance, for weeks, nay, months past, the want of justification for the enhanced rates introduced into the revision settlement of Alibag has been the subject of animated correspondence in the two daily papers of Bombay, especially the *Times of India*. In this connection, the letter which appeared over the signature of "C. R. Sail" in the *Times of India* of May 13th last, made the startling announcement that, in the classification of garden lands in the Alibag Taluka, the Survey Department, while pretending to confirm the old classification of soils in the revision work, actually modified the old 32 anna scale into 24 anna scale. The effect of this was that soil and water factors were over-classed, and that no adequate regard was paid to the importance of water in garden lands. What was the reply of the Hon. Mr. Nugent to the inconvenient but pertinent points raised in the question put by the Hon. Mr. Javerilal, whether the attention of Government had been drawn to the letter of Mr. C. R. Sail in the *Times of India* and how far the statements in that letter were well-founded? Here are the words of Mr. Nugent's reply:

> "The attention of Government has not been called to the letter referred to, and Government cannot undertake to make any enquiries regarding, or *in any manner* to take notice of, statements which are made otherwise than in representations addressed to them in accordance with the rules."

What would be thought of a similar reply from a Cabinet Minister to a question, founded on a letter in the *Times*, put in the House of Commons by an hon. member? Such a reply is against the practice and the traditions of the Bombay Council. Numerous instances have occurred in which Government members have put questions founded on statements in the press with the express purpose of showing how unfounded the statements were. So that it comes to this, that when an inconvenient question is put, the reply takes the form of evasion. To another question, Mr. Nugent replied:

> "Government reserve to themselves the right to determine what matters shall be noticed or not noticed in their Resolutions."

Mr. Birdwood declined to break silence with regard to papers showing why Government consider particular persons unfit for their service. On these replies, a daily Bombay paper makes the flippant remark that "the most captious critic who possesses any acquaintance with the principles of the art of government could not gainsay any of the three positions thus taken up by the hon. Board." If the writer knew anything of the hardships involved in withholding information from agriculturists in a matter that vitally affects their daily life, and the discontent which is thus produced among them, he might not have spoken of the replies so lightheartedly.

(2).—THE BUDGET DISCUSSION.

The Hon. Mr. Nugent was not more happy in his replies to general points raised in course of the Budget discussion. They were marred by want of courtesy towards hon. members, and by disregard for the dignity of the Council. Their effect was to bring a serious and solemn discussion down to the level of a farce. Mr. Nugent's remarks made it clear that the weight of responsibility sat lightly upon him. He seemed to resent the reasonable and temperate criticism of non-official members. The discussion made it plain that the summary method of disposing of the Budget at one single sitting left him very little time to formulate his replies. The result was to place on record some points to which no reply was given. The hon. member saw at once the awkwardness of the position. "I find it impossible," he said, "now at a moment's notice to give the reasons for the numerous increases or decreases—most of them of comparatively small amounts—in various sub-heads to which the hon. Mr. Sayani has referred. To obtain the information to enable me to furnish these details in every instance would probably require some days." But his intolerance of non-official criticism was best shown when he expressed his opinion as to what that criticism was. His words were:

> "Before I refer briefly to the many matters touched upon in their speeches this afternoon by hon. members, I may, I trust, be pardoned for saying that it would strike a disinterested spectator who had sat in the gallery above to-day, and at the Budget meeting last year, and 1893, that this chamber, in addition to being a room for the manufacture of laws, and the examination of figures, was also a circus in which certain hon. members are wont to trot out annually their hobby horses, and further partook of the nature of a mortuary, in which other hon. members are accustomed to submit to *post-mortem* dissection annually, the corpses of old topics dug up yearly by them from graves in which those dead subjects might well have been allowed to decay in peace and silence. And if they will forgive me, I would range among the most energetic and persistent of these owners of hobbies and exhumers of dead subjects, the hon. Messrs Javerilal and Setalwad."

Here is a fine example of the bureaucratic arrogance which resents adverse criticism. If Mr. Nugent fancies that he can effectnally snub non-official members by exhibiting his dislike of the criticisms offered by them, he is grievously mistaken. They are made of much sterner stuff than he seems to give them credit for. The elected representatives in the enlarged Councils are now brought face to face with officials to discuss the problems which affect the daily life of the people. The points raised by them after careful study have to be answered. It will not do to shirk them. We note the contrast between the cynical contempt which pervades Mr. Nugent's tirade, and the frank and genuine expression of opinion in the closing remarks of Lord Sandhurst. His Excellency said: "As this is the first time I have attended a Budget meeting, it would, I deem, be more *respectful* to the Council, if I said a word or two." His Excellency characterised the debate as of a very temperate nature, and saw no objection to the speeches which had been made. As for the complaint that old topics had been brought forward, Lord Sandhurst remarked:

> "While he (Mr. Nugent) is familiar with these various subjects, and, as I understand him to say, recognises some old friends amongst them, I hear them for the first time, and they have been pleasant hearing to my ears."

In these words Lord Sandhurst would seem to have administered to his colleague a rebuke couched in soft words, of which the effect will not, we trust, be lost upon the hon. member when he again addresses the Council.

It may seem strange, but it is nevertheless a fact, that the supercilious remarks of the member in charge of Bombay finance did not call forth a word of comment from the two daily Anglo-Indian papers in Bombay. The *Advocate of India* was the first to sound a note of disapproval. The vernacular and Anglo-vernacular press with one voice condemn the indecorous treatment of the non-official members. *Native Opinion*, for instance, remarks:

> "But who accords this opportunity of trotting out the hobby-horses? The remedy against the evil is in the hands of the Government themselves. Let the black spots pointed out to them be removed from time to time, and independent members will find no opportunity for 'trotting out their hobby-horses.' It ill became the dignity of a Legislature to have its popular representatives treated in this off-hand fashion, and the intervention of Lord Sandhurst was necessary in order to cut short an acerbity of language that did not elevate but lowered the dignity of the Council in popular estimation."

What seemed chiefly to have nettled Mr. Nugent was the reference in the debate to the one anna cess of *sayer* revenue levied on every rupee of *abkari* revenue collected throughout the Presidency and designed to be used for promoting primary education among the rural and urban population in the Mofussil under sec. 6 of Bombay Act III of 1869 (Local Funds Act). In 1873 the Government directed that a lump sum of Rs. 1,55,000 be paid to local boards in place of the actual collections. Doubtless the sum then fixed was reasonable and fair as representing the average collections of the time. But *abkari* revenue has made rapid strides in course of the last twenty-two years and now amounts to over a crore of rupees, on which the one anna cess of *sayer* revenue would amount to over six lakhs of rupees. The Local Board Act of 1884 has not repealed sec. 6 of the old Local Fund Act III of 1869, and Mr. Javerilal urged, and urged very properly, that as long as the section remained unrepealed, the Local Board in the Presidency had a fair claim upon the Government to be allowed the use of the actual realisations of the one anna cess. At present the difference between the actual collections on this account and the lump sum of over a lakh and a-half paid to local boards represents the amount which goes into the provincial exchequer, but which rightly belongs to the local boards for expenditure in the extension of primary education. It is true that the Government sets apart a sum for the extension of primary schools, but if, over and above such grants, the local boards had at their disposal the full collections of the one anna cess of *sayer* revenue which rightly belongs to them, the interests of popular education would be considerably enhanced. The Government makes grants with one hand from what it takes away with the other, and pretends so to advance the cause of primary education in the Mofussil. It was this point which the Hon. Mr. Kirkham missed when he claimed credit for Government for advancing primary education while rebuking the Bombay Municipality for its niggardliness in this matter. By all means let the Government have credit for what is due. But even that body would disclaim credit given under false pretences.

Another blemish that came prominently to view in the proceedings had to do with the mode in which the debate on the Budget was conducted. At first, every one of the non-officials without exception was called upon to offer remarks. When their number was exhausted, the official members were asked to state their views. Accordingly some of the criticisms of the non-official members were replied to by the the Hon. Mr. Kirkham, the Hon. Mr. Macpherson (Advocate-General) and the Hon. Mr. Little. They were followed by the members of the Government, the Hon. Messrs. Birdwood and Nugent. Such a mode of conducting debate was found manifestly unfair, inasmuch as it left no opportunity to non-official members to reply to the official criticisms. It was also contrary to past practice, which was to call upon a few non-official members (especially the most junior) to state their views first and to follow them up by official members, leaving to a few non-officials still an opportunity for replying to official criticisms. Such an opportunity was not given, and the debate proved to be altogether one-sided and unfair. It is to be hoped that Lord Sandhurst will not permit a repetition of this glaring blunder. Let a few non-officials address the Council first and let them be followed by officials whose criticisms may be replied to by any of the remaining non-officials. In this way, and in this way only, can the public be placed in a position to judge of the merits of the points discussed.

A third defect is as noticeable in the reporting of the proceedings by the press. A reporter on the staff of one of the daily Anglo-Indian papers in Bombay is paid by Government for officially reporting the debate. From him it is that the other daily papers take a copy. The paid reporter on this occasion gave a very meagre report of what the non-official members said, while at the same time he devoted column after column to reporting in full the speeches of official members. The result was to make the whole reporting a mere farce in public estimation. The many points which formed the groundwork of official animadversions were to be looked for in vain in the published reports of non-official speeches. The public, therefore, could hardly grasp the non-official arguments and their merits. It is occasions like this which accentuate the need in Bombay of a daily organ of educated native opinion on passing questions of the day. It is scarcely creditable to the intelligence, public spirit, enterprise and commercial activity of the educated classes that Bombay should not possess a single daily paper conducted in English which might be looked upon as their organ. Calcutta claims three such daily papers and Madras has two. Will not Bombay rise to the occasion and supply the sorely felt want?

Reviews.

A NOBLE LIFE.

The Old Missionary. By Sir WILLIAM W. HUNTER, K.C.S.I., M.A., LL.D. (Henry Frowde.)

Very seldom indeed is it the good fortune of a reviewer to come across a story so simple and touching, so picturesque and suggestive, so broad-minded and noble, as Sir William Hunter's affectionate picture of "The Old Missionary." A cross-section of a portion of Anglo-Indian life and experience, it exhibits in rapid strokes and in vivid colours some remarkable aspects of personal devotion and of human kindliness. "Trafalgar" Douglas—for as a midshipman he had seen Nelson's signal run up at Trafalgar—was the only son of an old Scottish commodore, who had left his impoverished tower on the Solway and chased the enemies of England on the high seas for some forty years. Whatever the bottom motive, it was the reading of Captain Cook's voyages that struck young Douglas with the idea of becoming a missionary in India. A short experience of the inefficacy of mere Evangelism drove him home to equip himself at Edinburgh in surgery and medicine; and, having fallen under the influence of Edward Irving, he returned to India as a medical missionary, deeply imbued with the mysteries and symbolism of the Catholic Apostolic Church. Under the compulsion of experience, however, he had gradually softened down his tenets, and "became simply the spiritual and temporal leader of the hillmen. He remained a Scotch Episcopalian, as his forefathers had been, but with no strong dogmas, and only a great daily desire to do the best for his people."

Mr. Douglas had always worked on his own plans and his own resources, and had never attached himself definitely to any of the missionary societies. His influence spread widely and deeply.

"The highest piety," said the lieutenant-governor to the narrator, the district magistrate, "seems to win its way as unconsciously as the finest tact. What a work he has done in these hills without ever knowing it! I once asked him, when I was magistrate of the district, to tell me his secret for managing six thousand borderers without a policeman or a case ever coming into court. He answered simply that they were Christians. Why, his encampment to-night is on the very spot where the clans assembled yearly after the November harvest to hold their drunken festival of the New Rice, and then to sally forth on their cold-weather raid upon the lowlands. If anything were to happen to my old friend, I wonder what would become of his *Civitas Dei* in the forest?"

The old missionary preached, schoolmastered in simple and practical ways, planted out stations under natives trained by him, judged the people's disputes, and healed their diseases. In the first chapter he interests himself with the lieutenant-governor for the release of some of the hillmen that had been imprisoned for taking part in a rising. "I must say for Trafalgar Douglas," the lieutenant-governor privately admitted, "that if we had listened to his warnings, the oppressions of the money-lenders, which drove the tribes to revolt, would have been looked into before the rising, instead of after it. He kept his own hillmen quiet, too, through the business, and so broke up the common agreement which might have rendered the affair more awkward than it proved." How suggestive is the episode, yet how often has its lesson been—and will be—neglected!

The great aim of the Old Missionary was to mould the minds of the young generation. He had been impressed with John Lawrence's parting words in 1840:—"The only way that will bring the natives to truer and more enlightened ideas is the gradual progress of education. The attempts to change the faith of the adult population have hitherto failed, and will, I am afraid, continue to fail." In connection with this aspect of his work, Sir William Hunter interweaves some useful criticism of educational methods. It was to the second generation also that the missionary looked for converts. "In former days," remarked the lieutenant-governor, "if I ventured to congratulate him on his success among the people, he used to say, sadly, that during his long life he had baptised many, but he did not know that he had made a single Christian." When the story opens, however, there is a new hopefulness in the old man's heart. A Brahman lad, whom he had sheltered from the wrath of his relatives and sent to college in Calcutta, had developed an enthusiasm of Christian faith, and proved an eloquent and impressive preacher. The candid energy of the Brahman's beliefs, and his insistence on a close conformity with the authorised order of worship, led to a crisis in the hill church, which is described throughout with masterly skill and with effective suggestion. Especially notable is the young minister's demand for the Athanasian creed and the Old Missionary's firm refusal, helpless with illness as he then was, to permit it. The passage is strikingly dramatic:—

"At the last revival meeting the catechists resolved, among other things, to insist on the Athanasian creed being read on the following Trinity Sunday, and deputed the deacon to report their ultimatum.

"'So long as I live,' replied the Old Missionary slowly, and with a solemn emphasis on each word, 'the church in which I have preached Christ's message of mercy shall never be profaned by man's dogma of damnation.'

"'My father, my father,' the young Brahman answered, almost breaking into sobs, 'do not speak so. For unless you consent to have the full Trinity service, as laid down in the Prayer Book, we have bound ourselves not to enter the chapel.'

"'God's will be done,' said the old man sadly, but firmly"

The calmness and breadth of view, of experience, are contrasted powerfully with the fervour and indiscipline of youth; and the subsequent bringing to reason of the Brahman minister is carried through its various stages with quiet but deft effectiveness. Another side of the religious and social situation shows a remarkable conflict and settlement between the Old Missionary and a neighbouring Roman Catholic communion—a settlement successfully concluded on patriarchal principles.

The Old Missionary had a daughter. About ten years back, a brother missionary on his way down from Benares died after a long illness in his house, leaving a daughter penniless and friendless, and Trafalgar Douglas had married her, as the obvious solution of the difficult situation. Mrs. Douglas died in giving birth to a daughter. This little girl, with her tender ways, clings to the Missionary like ivy to an old gnarled trunk, compassing him with sweet observances. In his earlier life, the Old Missionary had compiled a grammar of the hitherto unwritten speech of the hillmen, and now in his old age he was sedulously, though more and more slowly, labouring to complete a dictionary. In his work he was helped from time to time by the assistant magistrate, Ayton, a Boden scholar and a Fellow of his college, and by Ayton's Sanskrit pandit. When each word was settled, the little daughter pasted the slip recording the results in its alphabetical order on the tough sheets of yellow country paper, brightening the spirit of the old man with her presence and helpfulness. But eventually the Old Missionary's eyes gave way and he became totally blind; and subsequently he fell ill. The courage and resignation of the poor fellow are pictured with a sympathetic and tender touch which is deeply affecting; and the effect is greatly enhanced by the gentle solicitude and affectionate tendance of the little girl, and by the ready and devoted interest of the officials. Nor less striking is the devotion of the old man's native servant during the lingering illness:

> "His servant, a hard-working devout old Mussulman, who represented in that modest household the joint train of Hindu and Muhammadan domestics in ordinary Anglo-Indian establishments, never quitted the door of the sick-room, except to prepare his master's food in the kitchen, or to pray with his face towards Mecca five times each twenty-four hours. Day and night he was ready at the slightest call; always calm, always helpful, always in spotless white garments, and apparently needing no sleep, save what he could snatch sitting on his heels, with a rocking movement, in the veranda. . . . He had an almost feminine tenderness of touch, and a slow gentleness of hand that made us feel him to be a better nurse than any of us."

Nor can we omit the testimony of the surrounding population to the influence of the Old Missionary, and to the potency of those touches of human nature which—and which alone—make even Indians and Englishmen kin:

> "Meanwhile the news had reached the jungle country that the old missionary lay sick. Groups of short thick-built hillmen began to encamp on the outskirts of his orchard. When it became known that his life was in danger, their women also arrived. In the early morning we saw them silently drawing water from the fish-pond: all through the burning day they sat smoking and waiting under the trees; the drying embers of their cooking fires glowed with a dull red throughout the night. The doctor wanted to send them away, so as to keep the sick house as clear as possible of human beings. But the old missionary pleaded for them, and indeed the space was large enough if they would only be quiet. It was marvellous to see that gathering of hillmen, accustomed to the incessant chatter of their forest hamlets, stealing noiselessly about or sitting in silent circles."
>
> "One afternoon the headmen of the Christian clans were allowed to come into the veranda, but the sight of their blind and prostrate leader and the presence of unknown Europeans (the doctor and myself) seemed to take away their powers of speech. The old missionary talked kindly but feebly to them, while they stood shy and restrained, almost without a word. The interview threatened to end in awkward silence, when an aged grey-haired hill-woman, the mother of one of the prisoners whose release the missionary had obtained, pushed through the men, and, throwing herself on her knees at the bottom of the bed, kissed the old man's feet with sobs and blessings."

It is a simple story enough, but the virtue of it lies in Sir William Hunter's telling of it. Rightly considered, indeed, it may be regarded as one of the very greatest of the great things he has done for the illustration of Indian life and English government in India. For nothing could more powerfully inculcate the fundamental principle that it is knowledge and sympathy beyond all else that are necessary in Anglo-Indian relations. In itself, the story of the old missionary has a spiritual value of the highest importance; and it is told with consummate literary skill and in the most admirable tone. In its political implications, it is more valuable than a scientific frontier and many battalions; it is a gem beyond all price.

THE BUDDHA AND HIS RELIGION.

The Buddha and His Religion. By J. Barthélemy Saint Hilaire. Translated by Laura Ensor. (Routledge & Sons, 1895.) "Sir John Lubbock's Hundred Books."

This translation immediately recalls Mr. Rhys Davids' remark on the original work: "If you want to have a thoroughly erroneous and unreliable view of early Buddhism, let me recommend to your perusal a much-praised work by M. Barthélemy St. Hilaire, entitled 'Le Bouddha et sa Religion'."

> "As evidence of what early Buddhism actually was, it [the Lalita Vistara, which furnishes, says Mr. Davids, most of the material for M. St. Hilaire] is of about the same value as some mediæval poems would be of the real facts of the Gospel history; and when used for the purposes for which M. St. Hilaire has used it, its very real value, as evidence of Nepalese beliefs at the time when it was composed, is lost sight of and forgotten."

Mr. Rhys Davids goes on to say that there is no evidence that the Lalita Vistara was made canonical about a hundred years after Christ, and no history of it which is earlier than that of its Tibetan version, which may be much later and cannot be earlier than the thousandth year after Gotama's birth.

When, however, Mr. Rhys Davids gives, in his own new and revised edition of "Buddhism" (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), published last year, an account of the "fundamental truths" of Buddhism, he states that the Lalita Vistara account agrees on the whole with the actual words of the Pali text translated by Mr. Davids, and with the Chinese life. And in a note he adds that all other accounts of the Truths are derived from them. So that, after all, the version from which M. B. St. Hilaire derives his materials is one which must be employed as an authority by Mr. Davids himself. That Mr. Davids' condemnation of M. St. Hilaire's work is to be taken with qualification is evident from the fact that in the accounts which both works give of the Noble Truths, and the Noble Eight-Fold Path, of the Buddhist Ten Commandments and the rules of the Order, there is very little that is different.

Nevertheless, on such a subject as the contents of the Noble Truths, M. St. Hilaire is not precise. The second, for instance, he thus reports: "The cause of suffering, which the Buddha attributes to passions, sinful lusts"; but the translation, as given by Mr. Davids in the Sutra of the foundation of the kingdom of righteousness, is as follows: "Verily it is that thirst (or craving) causing the renewal of existence, accompanied by sensual delight, seeking satisfaction now here, now there." The renewal of existence was to Buddha itself, and altogether a wrong object of desire. But though M. St. Hilaire has omitted this important fact from his version of the Second Noble Truth, he elsewhere asserts what it seems impossible to doubt, that non-existence was regarded in early Buddhism as the final fate of the servant of the Law. When, again, he explains the Nirvana which may be won in this life, M. St. Hilaire is inclined to regard the mental states called Dhyanas as "the method and practices of Nirvana." Apparent confirmation of this view might be adduced. Whether, however, they were conditions which all must attain who entered Nirvana, is another question. Of the Nirvana attainable in this world, M. St. Hilaire's description must be pronounced weak, and, perhaps, in some parts, misleading; but his delineation of the righteousness by means of which that state was to be gained is permeated with a sympathy and expressed with a power which make it highly effective. True, he has avowedly gone to late sources, but that fact does not, as we have seen, justify the very sweeping verdict pronounced by Mr. Davids. Some Buddhist virtues M. St. Hilaire seems to invest with a meaning and to estimate at a value which the fundamental teachings of the system will not allow them to possess. The Buddhist charity was one that was to be excited first and chiefly by the perception of suffering. The existence of suffering, its cause, the means by which it could be removed, were *the* truths of Buddhism. All its virtues were to have these for their starting-points and reasons. The charity which was to aim at removing suffering is not the endless charity nor the reverent love taught by Christianity. Nay, if suffering was to be avoided, even pity was to be reined in when it brought mental pain; fellow-feeling must be restrained from sharing in grief. This was the logical result, but it is impossible to believe it was reduced to practice. It is impossible to read the Buddhist picture of kindness and devotion, and imagine so non-natural a discipline of the heart to have underlain them. The natural affections have a nobleness of their own, and the truth probably is that they lifted many a Buddhist, if not most, above the limits imposed by their creed.

For the newest expositions of Buddhism a reader must go to later works. He will find in some of these a better sifted, better analysed, more precise and more full account of Buddhist doctrine. In M. St. Hilaire's critical estimate, however, he will see much that may correct the too favourable presentation of Buddhism given in Mr. Rhys Davids' lecture. The author's account of the actual condition of Buddhism in Ceylon he derives mainly from Mr. Spence Hardy.

AN INDIAN NOVEL.

Krishna Kanta's Will. By BANKIM CHANDRA CHATTERJEE. Translated by MIRIAM S. KNIGHT, with Introduction, Glossary, and Notes, by J. F. BLUMHARDT, M.A. (London: T. Fisher Unwin.)

The translator of a foreign novel usually finds himself confronted by an awkward dilemma. Either in the attempt to write English he deviates so far from the form of his original as to make his characters talk as only Englishmen talk, or he must be content to let the outlines of the original be seen under their English dress. In the one case that piquant charm which belongs to things foreign is lost. In the other case, that grotesque incongruity is produced which is apparent especially in all but the best translations of French novels. In dealing with "Krishna Kanta's Will," (the second novel of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee published by Mr. Fisher Unwin, who seems to be bent on doing for Oriental fiction what Mr. Heinemann is trying to do for modern European fiction) Mrs. Knight appears on the whole to have deftly escaped between the horns of the dilemma by proving the possibility of a third course. Without making Hindus talk contemporary English slang she has avoided the ludicrous "English through foreign idiom" that proves the stumbling block of so many translators. Her translation produces the impression of a rendering sufficiently literal to preserve the quaint forms of the original, but differing from ordinary English only in a certain archaic simplicity of expression—serving to remind the reader that the tale is concerned with a people and a state of society which, although existent in modern times, is of very ancient and primitive character. The plot of the novel is in keeping with the conditions of this society. Krishna Kanta Rai, whose frequently changed will gives the tale its title, is a rich Hindu with a wicked young son, Hara Lal, and a good nephew, Gobind Lal, who is happily married to Bhramar. The other principal character is Rohini, a beautiful young widow whose subjection to the treatment customary among Hindus towards people in her unfortunate position has rendered her character suitable to her *rôle* as the female villain. In the hope of inducing Hara Lal to marry her she agrees to substitute a forged will for the real will of Krishna Kanta which stands in favour of Gobind Lal. This done, her disappointment, a chance meeting and a casual word of kindness from the handsome Gobind Lal, of whom she becomes enamoured, cause her to wish her evil work undone. In the attempt to restore the real will she is caught and accused of stealing, confesses, and by the intervention of Gobind Lal, now aware of her weakness, is released. Bhramar, with a woman's sense of impending evil, naïvely suggests to Rohini the advisability of suicide. Rohini, contrary to expectation, tries to drown herself, but is rescued by Gobind Lal, who now for the first time feels the power of her beauty, and unwisely conceals the incident from Bhramar. To escape temptation he goes away on a journey. In his absence Rohini spreads scandal in order to bring about a division between Gobind Lal and Bhramar. How the unjust suspicions of Bhramar and the tongue of popular rumour forced Gobind Lal into the sin he had struggled to avoid; how the final form taken by Krishna Kanta's Will, and the pride of sin prevented a reconciliation between husband and wife; the disappearance of Rohini and of Gobind Lal, and the final end of both as well as of the injured Bhramar, we leave the author to relate. Enough has been told to show that the plot is simple and tragic. The action is based upon primitive passions and instincts and appeals to the sympathies of the reader with a power denied to the subtleties of the modern neuropathic novel. In these days when the market is deluged with character studies of impossible characters, and studies of problems wherein by careful choice of special characters and special circumstances the conditions are made unreal and so the case adduced loses all its value as a test case, one welcomes with perhaps exaggerated joy a tale in which action and character are made proportionate and interdependent in their development, and where events are allowed to point their own moral, save for an occasional remark from the story-teller in a simple charming old-world manner. With this simplicity of style is combined an insight into character which enables the author to trace with great clearness the process by which the actors are brought into their various positions, and to state with brevity and lucidity the limitations of their action imposed upon them by each crisis as it develops. There is no laboured analysis of feelings and motives, but a power of grasping salient points and a clear perception of the necessary connexion of events which mark the true story-teller. So that the conclusion of the story has an inevitableness that we look for in vain in so many of the novels of late years.

The tragedy of the plot is relieved by much graceful description and delightful imagery such as one naturally looks for in the work of an Oriental writer. But the colours are by no means laid on with traditional Oriental lavishness. Rather the author imposes on himself a subdued tone which suggests less the bold colouring of an Indian noon than the soft black and silver of tropical moonlight. As we turn the pages many an opportunity for a smile also beguiles our reading. There is much excellent fooling in some of the earlier conversations between Gobind Lal and his wife; an entertaining account of an interview between Gobind Lal and his uncle; a (perhaps unconsciously) humorous description of the way in which information may be obtained from an Indian local postmaster, and many other diverting passages, some of which no doubt derive their humour from the *naïveté* of author or translator or both. Interesting in itself as literature the book ought to be especially interesting to English readers as a specimen product of Bengali talent at the end of the nineteenth century, and an introduction to the actual conditions of life in a Hindu community governed at the present day much on the lines of the patriarchal system. Indirectly it throws much light on the status of women in India, notably on the position of Hindu widows.

The numerous Indian terms and customs that crop up everywhere to befog the uninitiated are explained in a brief but complete appendix and glossary at the end of the volume. The preface gives a short sketch of the author's life. The whole is well printed on thick hand-made paper, uncut, and might with advantage have been put in a stronger binding than a paper cover.

LORD PALMERSTON.

Life of Viscount Palmerston. By LLOYD C. SANDERS. Statesmen Series. (W. H. Allen & Co.)

The merits and demerits of this book are alike due to one fact—the enthusiasm of Mr. Sanders for the memory of Lord Palmerston. He makes a figure, which cannot fail to be picturesque, seem almost heroic, and by the glamour thereby cast over it, he is like to mislead his readers. For it was only in a very qualified sense that Lord Palmerston deserved the name of statesman. It was not alone that, as his opponents urged against him, he treated grave questions of policy with an unbecoming levity, nor that he was determined to carry out his own wishes at the expense of the loyalty due to his sovereign or his colleagues. Few men have ever directed the foreign relations of England for so long with so little appreciation of Continental opinion. Palmerston understood the English nature thoroughly, and thereby he secured a hold on the people, which enabled him to commit blunders that would have been fatal to almost any other politician. But other nations he did not understand, and consequently the whole course of his foreign policy was misdirected, with the exception of his earliest achievement—the creation of the kingdom of Belgium. In Spain and Portugal, for instance—where the practical alternatives were either a vigorous interference, which might have had the effect of settling the disputes as to the succession in both countries at the expense of peace with Austria, or, what would probably have been wiser, a strict neutrality—the undecided policy of Palmerston resulted only in a quarrel with France, after the fiasco of the Quadruple Alliance, which Mr. Sanders considers a stroke of genius, and in the worse confusion of the already desperate situation in the Peninsula. From this chaos whatever emerged was saved by the ultimate triumph of French diplomacy over his best laid schemes. With the same narrowness of comprehension which led him to believe that the Spanish nation would submit to dictation without any backing of force, Palmerston refused to believe in the decay of the Turkish Empire. His relationships with Eastern politics were, indeed, peculiarly unfortunate. In the matter of the Danubian principalities time has conclusively proved that his plan for keeping Moldavia and Wallachia separate would have been only instrumental in bringing about the very end he wished to avoid—of throwing the Roumanians into the power of Russia. Greece is said, like many other countries, such as Poland, to have had the blessing of his sympathetic interest. But he certainly took no definite steps to help, as he might have done, in the establishment of a strong kingdom, which was particularly necessary for a nation just escaped from the ruinous burden of Turkish rule, which had been crushing them for centuries. But his most shortsighted policy was in regard to the Suez Canal, the construction of which he opposed continuously and vigorously: a line of action which it is difficult to excuse even by supposing, as Mr. Sanders does, that he did not grasp either the engineering or the financial arguments, both of which it is surely a Foreign Minister's business to grasp in such a situation. These examples of the misdirection of Palmerston's efforts can be increased by reference to his policy with regard to Denmark, which might indirectly ascribe to him the war with Prussia and the loss of Schleswig-Holstein; with regard to America, which was almost perpetually, during his administration, on the verge of being provoked to war, with the result of fixing in the American mind that desire to "twist the British lion's tail," which still occasionally complicates relations with England; and with regard to Italy, where, despite his profession of friendship for the cause of Italian unity, he preferred to follow an opportunist line rather than make the definite stand to which his public expressions of opinion almost committed him. The natural result of Palmerston's failure to understand foreigners was that he distrusted them, and was distrusted by them in return. The whole course of his relations with France was marked by this want of trust on both sides, which became more pronounced in the later years of his life. In this respect he reflected the spirit of his youth, when the perfidy of the neighbour was an article of faith with each nation. And thus, at times when a mutual understanding had been secured, a rupture always followed. Fortunately both for England and India, Palmerston had little to do with the administration of the latter country. The failures and follies of the first Afghan war found in him, if not their author, their apologist; and this one instance may show what a fatal result there would probably have been if Palmerston's singular power of doing the wrong thing had had free play in India. But, however much Palmerston's judgment has been refuted by time, Mr. Sanders still admires him. And the danger is lest the life of this man attractive as his personality always is, even when only shadowed in the pages of *Punch* or preserved in his witty sayings, should win any followers to a policy which must now be regarded as out of date. The diplomatists of to-day must walk far more warily than those of Palmerston's time, and any attempt to revive the Palmerstonian methods at the Foreign Office would now inevitably lead to war.

THE COST OF THE SHAHZADA'S VISIT.

The surprise and the indignation of the people of India at the decision to throw upon them the expense of the Shahzada's recent visit to England are manifest throughout the Indian journals. The following passages from a memorial which the Bombay Presidency Association has addressed to Lord George Hamilton may be taken as a fair indication of the prevailing feeling. The people of India, says the memorial, "have learned with dismay the resolution of Her Majesty's Government that the entire cost of the Prince's visit should be defrayed by the Indian Exchequer, which is already embarrassed, and in the direst financial straits for some years past to bring about an equilibrium in the ordinary annual balance-sheet of the Empire, in spite of additional taxation amounting to 7 crores of rupees, which the taxpayers could ill afford to bear. It was everywhere understood in India that Prince Nasrullah Khan was the guest of the British people. He was in England in loyal response to the friendly invitation of Her Majesty's Government. It was taken for granted that the splendid hospitality accorded to him was an offering—an altruistic offering of wealthy and mighty England. As nothing appeals so much to the heart of an Asiatic as hospitality, we leave it to your Lordship in Council to imagine the effect on an Oriental mind like that of the Prince the fact of that wealthy England playing the host, but laying on the shoulders of a country avowedly so poor, so helpless, and almost so voiceless as India, the cost of his entertainment, said to amount to 30 lakhs. . . . . There is again one other important factor which must not be left out of consideration—the dismal shadow which now so heavily rests upon the finances of India. The injustice of the decision is made doubly unjust by this grievous circumstance. It is a widely known fact, which will hardly be gainsaid, that the Government of India, since 1885, has been in a condition, more or less, of chronic financial embarrassment. And, perhaps, at no time has it felt that embarrassment so acutely as at the present moment, with a probable deficit in the current year's budget of over 2 crores, consequent on the late unfortunate and much to be regretted expedition to Chitral. Many a State department is refused adequate funds, while many an object of great public utility and productivity has to be indefinitely postponed or starved, simply because the Government could not afford the requisite wherewithal."

INSECT BITES OR STINGS, CHAFED SKIN, PILES, CUTS, SORE EYES,
SUNBURN, EARACHE, NEURALGIC AND RHEUMATIC PAINS, THROAT
COLDS, AND SKIN AILMENTS, QUICKLY RELIEVED BY USE OF

CALVERT'S
CARBOLIC OINTMENT.

Large Pots, 1s. 1½d. each (English Rate).

Keeps good in any Climate—Free from Animal Fat.

PRIVATE REPORT FROM LIMASSOL, CYPRUS—
"I have never found anything to come up to it for Neuralgic and Rheumatic pains."

Numerous other favourable reports have been received.

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

OCTOBER, 1895.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE. "Kashmir."

CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. Bonnar, Rev. W., "The English in India."

GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE. Walker, E. O., "Singhpur, an Indian Station."

HARPER'S MAGAZINE. Weekes, E. L., "Hindus and Moslems."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). Bowring, L. B., "Old Punjab Days."

NATIONAL REVIEW. Seton-Karr, W. S., "The Rulers in India." Wilkinson, Spenser, "Chitral."

NINETEENTH CENTURY. Lord Brassey, "The Closing of the Indian Mints."

SUNDAY MAGAZINE. Wick, J. H., "In the Punjab."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

OCTOBER, 1895.

LAWRENCE, WALTER R., I.C.S., C.I.E. ...."The Valley of Kashmir." (Henry Frowde) .... 12s. 0d.

LANGTON, JARVIS ...."A Foster Son: A Tale of the Indian Mutiny." (Simpkin, Marshall) .... — —

SMITH, GEORGE, C.I.E., LL.D. ...."Bishop Heber, Poet and Chief Missionary to the East, Second Lord Bishop of Calcutta 1783-1826." (Murray) .... 10s. 6d.

HOLDEN, EDWARD S., LL.D. ...."The Mogul Emperors of Hindustan, A.D. 1398-A.D. 1707." (Constable) .... 10s. 6d.

ABERIGH-MACKAY, GEORGE ...."Twenty-one Days in India, being the Tour of Sir Ali Baba, K.C.B." (W. H. Allen) .... 6s. 0d.

RECENT PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

[C.—7887.] STATISTICAL ABSTRACT relating to British India from 1884-85 to 1893-94............ 1s. 3d.

472—Sess. 2.—EAST INDIA (STAFF CORPS OFFICERS).—Return of copies of papers containing the recommendations made by the Government of India in order to prevent the Supersession of Staff Corps Officers by those of the Line.... 0s. 2½d.

[C.—7888.] Thirty-ninth Report of Her Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners, with Appendix 0s. 3½d.

CELEBRATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF TULSIKRIT RAMAYAN. By Mr. F. S. GROWSE, M.A., C.I.E. Complete in 3 volumes. Fifth Edition. Highly spoken of both by English and Native Press. Also Second-hand books on sale. Price Rs. 3-6 by V.P. Post in India, and 4s. 6d. in England. Apply to Babu HARPRASAD, Municipal Commissioner, Fatehgarh, N.W.P., India.

A.V.C.BROS
TRY ONCE.

INDIAN SCENTS.
Rare, Jasmine, Thalamboo, and other Attars, R.1 per tola.
Sandal Attar, as.10 per tola.
Pudukota Billais, each as.10.

NOVELTIES IN INDIAN JEWELLERY,
ETC. MADRAS FASHIONS.

ORNAMENTS SET WITH RUBIES.	Rs. Rs.
Kammals ...	100 to 350
Thodus	30—200
Pathakum ...	35—350
Kathiri Bavalies	70—300
Kurudu Bavalies	15— 70
Bullaku	35—250
Nose Screw ...	10— 70
Ear Rings ...	50—300

GOLD ORNAMENTS.	
Kasimalai ..	550—700
Kollikal Addigai	60—150
Kappu (bangle)	150—200
Thodas (chains)	150—200
Jaya Rings ...	15— 25
Vallam Pebbles	3— 25

GOLD HEAD ORNAMENTS.	Rs. Rs.
Gajjulu Nagar ...	35 to 70
Nagar	12—70
Parrot	9—70
Thirugupoo ...	4—7
Half-size do. ...	2-8—7
Sowri Kottai ...	4-8—6-8
Thalamboo ...	2-4—2-8

SILVER JEWELS.	
Golusu (leg chain)	70-120
Chain for watches	7—10
Victor buttons, set	5—6
Locket	3—5
Penholder	3—8
Snuff-box	8—10

All sorts of Silver Vessels, Rs.10 to Rs.100.
Bellmetal Kujah, Rs.5 to Rs.10.
Beneres Laced and Silk Cloths, each Rs.6 to Rs.100.
Kornadu, Female Cloth, Rs.8 to Rs.100.
Terms Cash or V.P.P. All other Jewels, etc., will be supplied. Illustrated "Trade Revealer" on application with half-anna postage stamp.
A. V. CHIDAMBARA IYER Bros.
Mayavaram, Madras Presidency, INDIA.

WANTED.

5,000 MEMBERS TO

THE HINDU FAMILY PROVISION FUND.

Those who subscribe to "*Arya Vartha*," an English Weekly Journal (Annual Subscriptions for India—Burma Rs. 5, Ceylon, Penang and Straits Rs. 6, Europe 12/-), will be enlisted as a member to the said Fund. Rupees 900 for every paid subscriber to the "*Arya Vartha*" will be equally divided amongst the nominee of the paid subscribers who die within the 31st March of every year. Agreement duly registered.

☞ You need not remit your subscription now. Please register your names. The Journal will be out at Madras as soon as 1,000 members are registered. Rules on application, with ½ anna postage stamp.

MANAGER,
"ARYA VARTHA,"
MAYAVARAM (S. INDIA).

TRADE MARK. JVARA-HARI. ज्वरहरि ജ്വരഹരി జ్వరహరి

Is what its name implies, **FEVER DESTROYER,** and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. WOOD, Captain 2nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value-payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Cuddalo Municipal Councillors' Office.
I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM CARPOOR" 8 ans., 1 Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free.
To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY,
43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C. AND 27, SECOND LINE BEACH, MADRAS.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]
[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI., No. 12.]
(NEW SERIES.)]
DECEMBER, 1895.
[SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID,
Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus" .. 353
Our Scientific Frontier 358
The Judiciary and the Executive in India: "Interview" with Mr. Manomohan Ghose 360
OUR LONDON LETTER 364
Mr. Balfour on Chitral 366
The "Apportionment of Charge": Sir G. Wingate's Opinions in 1859 367
TO FRIENDS IN INDIA, by A. O. Hume 369
THE COMING CONGRESS, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D. 371
PAGE
INDIAN CHRISTIANS AND THE CONGRESS, by A. Nundy .. 372
THE EXTERNAL POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, by J. Dacosta 374
Lord Lansdowne on Chitral 377
What the "Forward" Policy Means: "New Dangers and Fresh Wrongs" 377
Dinner to Mr. Bhownaggree 379
British Opinions on Indian Affairs 380
REVIEW: Bimetallism and India 382
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects .. 383
Recent Parliamentary Papers 384

Indiana.

At the time of writing it is understood that a distinguished Muhammadan will preside over the forthcoming Session of the Indian National Congress, which will be held at Poona during the closing days of the year. Such a choice would be a significant token of that loyal co-operation for political purposes which the Congress has from the outset sought to foster among the divers creeds and races of the Indian empire. The enemies of the Congress are never tired of dwelling upon differences. It is the duty, as it is the purpose, of the Congress to emphasise essential unity. Lord Harris, in common with many other critics, lately seized upon the difficulty that arose at Poona, with reference to the Social Conference, in order to discredit the Congress movement generally. Such critics, of course, only discredit themselves. At the same time, a certain section of the supporters of the Congress may do well to reflect upon the purpose for which even the appearance of division in their ranks is certain to be used by vigilant and embittered opponents. There is no need to discuss in detail the cause or the progress of the unfortunate difference of opinion which, at one time, gave rise to some uneasiness among the best friends of the Indian people. Our information upon the subject is necessarily incomplete. But the importance of the incident was doubtless exaggerated, and now, at any rate, it is past and gone. It is no occasion for hard words or bitter recrimination. There were doubtless faults of tact on both sides. But the hospitality which the Congress has uniformly extended to the Social Conference was never really in doubt, for, as the overwhelming majority of the supporters of the Congress perceive, nothing could be more antagonistic to their principles, or more destructive of all British sympathy with their purposes, than hostility on their part to social reform.

The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure held a series of sittings at the India Office between November 5th and 15th, and on the latter date adjourned until February next. A good deal of important evidence has been taken, chiefly, it is understood, upon what may be called the mechanism of Indian financial administration both in India and in England. The witnesses who have so far been examined include the ex-Finance Ministers, Sir Auckland Colvin and Sir David Barbour; Sir Henry Waterfield, Financial Secretary to the India Office; Mr. Stephen Jacob, Controller and Auditor General; General Sir Oliver Newmarck, formerly Military Secretary to the Government of India; Mr. A. R. Becher, Deputy Accountant General in the Public Works Department; Sir Charles Bernard, Secretary in the Revenue Department; and Mr. William Godsell, Auditor to the India Office. It is believed that in this first department of the Commission's enquiries the efforts of the non-official members have been directed chiefly towards showing that the existing checks upon Indian expenditure are somewhat illusory, and that some sort of organised Parliamentary control ought to be substituted for them. In other words, it would be desirable to combine the expert knowledge of the Finance Minister in India with the authority of a Standing Parliamentary Committee on Indian Finance. The remaining subjects of enquiry are the actual progress, as distinguished from the mechanism, of expenditure, and the apportionment of charge between India and the United Kingdom for purposes in which both are interested. It is suggested that *interim* reports will probably be issued, and that the rule, which at present excludes representatives of the Press from the sittings of the Commission, may hereafter be relaxed. We trust sincerely that these forecasts may prove to be accurate.

Considerable excitement has been caused in India by the introduction of a Bill into the Legislative Council, popularly called the Jury Bill, which threatens to revive the agitation provoked a few years ago by Sir Charles Elliott's notification practically abolishing trial by jury in Bengal. It will be remembered that, as the result of the labours of the Jury Commission appointed by the Government of India some two years ago, Sir Charles Elliott was compelled to withdraw his notification. Smarting, apparently, under the humiliation of that defeat, Sir Charles Elliott, on the eve of his retirement, seems to have suggested to the Government of India the necessity of fresh legislation on the subject, and Sir Alexander Miller, the law member, who has never concealed his opposition to the system of trial by jury even in England, has accordingly introduced a Bill amending the Code of criminal procedure in two respects. This Bill, if passed into law, would empower Sessions judges practically to cross-examine jurymen as to their verdict; and is further intended to make references to the High Court against the verdict of the jury easier than they now seem to be. The Government of Bengal had broadly suggested that "the Sessions judge should be specifically empowered or required to ascertain and record the reasons of the jury for their verdict." The Government of India, without professing to allow cross-examination of the jury as regards their reasons, seeks to empower the Sessions judge to obtain from the jury answers to specific questions to be framed by him. It is not difficult to see that, as is pointed out by certain Sessions judges themselves, this method of obtaining special verdicts must necessarily degenerate into a cross-examination of the jurymen as to the reasons of their verdict.

The public had imagined that the valuable report of the Jury Commission had, for a time at least, set at rest this unfortunate controversy regarding trial by jury in India. But Sir Alexander Miller, urged on by Sir Charles Elliott, seems to be determined to cause another unfortunate agitation. There is no need whatever to raise this question, unless the Government of India is determined to abolish trial by jury altogether. We should like to know how many jurymen, even in England, would care to sit, if they knew that they would be liable to be cross-examined by the presiding judge. As regards special verdicts, it should be borne in mind that jurymen frequently return their verdicts according to the impression created in their mind by the whole case, and it is not reasonable to expect that they should always be able to state logically and correctly the process of reasoning which enables them to arrive at a particular verdict. The present attempt to tinker with the existing law, therefore, seems to be an attempt to make trial by jury a farce. As was pointed out by Sir Charles Sargent, the late Chief Justice of Bombay, as well as by the Jury Commission, the proposed "procedure would be liable to create greater evils than it would remedy."

Nor is there the least necessity for altering the present section 307 of the Code, which empowers a judge to submit a case to the High Court only when the judge disagrees with the verdict "so completely that he considers it necessary for the ends of justice to submit the case to the High Court." These words were inserted in the Code after much deliberation and discussion, during the Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon, in order to discourage frivolous references by Sessions judges. But the Executive in India would apparently have every verdict of acquittal by a jury sent up to the High Court. Otherwise it is impossible to see why the law should be altered in this respect. It is now open to the judge to refer any case in which the ends of justice require such reference. No wonder that the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha has protested against this Bill in an address to the Viceroy and that the European community has also been alarmed, as we are told by the *Times'* correspondent. Lord Elgin's reply to the address of the Sabha shows, no doubt, that the Government has, as yet, an open mind on the subject, but if His Excellency attaches importance to the "Conservative administration of the law," as we are told that he does, why, we ask, should there be any meddling at all with the existing procedure?

As the Government of India has placed itself in a difficulty by taking action on the suggestion of Sir Charles Elliott, and as it may be prevented by its "prestige" from withdrawing the Bill, it may be well to suggest a way out of the difficulty. The following suggestion comes from Mr. Manomohan Ghose. Why not, he asks, do away altogether with the section empowering references by the Sessions judge, and simply enact that, in the event of the judge recording his clear dissent from the verdict, the Crown or the prisoner, as the case may be, should be allowed to appeal on the facts to the High Court. This should relieve the judge from any suspicion of partisanship and place him in a better position. At present there is no appeal on the facts against the verdict of a jury by either side in cases not referred to the High Court. In such cases an appeal lies on the ground of misdirection or other error of law only. In cases not tried by a jury the Crown already possesses a right of appeal against a finding of acquittal and that right is not limited to points of law only. Therefore, as the right of appeal against an acquittal already exists, what harm can there be in allowing it in cases in which the judge differs from the jury?

Sir William Hunter is to be congratulated upon the statesmanlike speech which he delivered at the Hotel Métropole on November 13th, on the occasion of the complimentary banquet to Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree, M.P. "The dinner," the official circular stated, "will be of a strictly non-party character," and Sir William Hunter made, as was to be expected, a strictly non-party speech. Thus, while he congratulated Mr. Bhownaggree upon his success at the general election, he did not hesitate to regret the defeat of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji:—

> "From this Imperial point of view (he said) they must all regret the absence of a well-known figure from the present Parliament. He for one could never mention the name of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji without sentiments of respect, for he could never forget that he was the first man who proved, after a long and hard struggle, that the House of Commons is open *de facto* as well as *de jure* to their fellow-subjects in India. He had disappeared from the scene for the moment. But, however widely some of them might differ from him in politics, he thought they must all hope to see him at some future day again in the position which he so gallantly won. (Cheers.)"

The matter and the manner of these remarks were alike admirable. They were precisely what one would have expected to hear at a meeting "of a strictly non-party character." Equally just and apt were Sir William Hunter's references to the Indian National Congress:—

> "The more advanced classes in this new India had organised themselves into an association which no Indian statesman and no Indian member of Parliament could overlook—he meant the Indian National Congress. Whatever they might think of the details of the programme of that Congress, it represented a political power in India which no Indian statesman and no Indian member of Parliament could afford to disregard. The Indian Congress was essentially the child of British rule, the product of our schools and universities. We had created and fostered the aspirations which animated the Congress, and it would be both churlish and unwise to refuse now to those aspirations both our sympathy and our respectful consideration."

Sir William Hunter proposed "The Guest of the Evening," and made the speech of the evening. If the rest of the speeches had been at all like his, they would have been more creditable to their authors and to the organisers of a dinner announced to be "of a strictly non-party character."

But unfortunately some of the other speakers utterly failed—if, indeed, they attempted—to maintain the impartiality which Sir William Hunter displayed, and which the organisers of the banquet had led their guests to expect. It is true that Sir Roper Lethbridge steered clear of the rocks, that the Earl of Jersey was content to be suitably eulogistic, and that Sir Lepel Griffin himself spoke neatly and sensibly. But Mr. Bhownaggree, in some passages of his speech, rather forgot the nature of the occasion, while as for that distinguished cricketer, Lord Harris, it can only be said that he made a woeful exhibition of himself. Now, of two things one. If the promoters of this banquet had convened a Tory and anti-Congress meeting, well and good. Their guests would have known what to expect. But to announce a dinner "of a strictly non-party character," to secure the attendance of Liberals and supporters of the Congress on this understanding, and then to permit two of the chief speakers to jeer at Liberals and to make charges and insinuations against the Congress, is not only in the worst possible taste, but is also perilously near akin to obtaining support under false pretences. Mr. Bhownaggree has been treated by the Congress with civility, and even with generosity. The British Committee, in its annual report, referred to him in friendly and appreciative terms, and we have in this journal consistently avoided any expression which might have engendered hostility in Mr. Bhownaggree towards any of his fellow-countrymen. Yet, at his non-party banquet, he permitted himself to speak of the Congress in a context of such phrases as "selfish ambition," "sentimental and misguided individuals," "puerile rhapsodies" that "tickle the youthful ear," "this loudly-coloured drop-scene painted by these agitators," and so forth. And Mr. Bhownaggree knew, or ought to have known, that there were sitting at the table with him such distinguished supporters of the Indian National Congress as Mr. Manomohan Ghose.

Mr. Bhownaggree's speech, however, was good taste itself compared with the violent tirade delivered by Lord Harris. This distinguished and noble statesman, who gave up to politics what was meant for the cricket field, is notoriously sensitive to criticism, but he ought to know that a non-party dinner does not afford a suitable occasion for replies to his critics or abuse of his opponents. As it was, the *Times* judiciously refrained from reporting any part of his speech, and it was severely bowdlerised even by a censor so little fastidious as the *Home News*, which reported Mr. Bhownaggree in full. Lord Harris, in the phraseology of cricket, "slogged" at every ball, but what he hit was his own wicket. He attacked the "cold-weather tourist," with special reference to Mr. Caine. He abused an imaginary army of Indian revolutionaries. He dwelt, not without some appearance of satisfaction, upon those animosities of race and religion which—to put it gently—he did so little to soothe. He "went bald-headed for" the supporters of the Congress, who, he said, if they had their way, would upset the whole fabric of the Empire—and this precious statement was loudly applauded, in the presence of Sir William Hunter and Mr. Manomohan Ghose, by the serried ranks of Anglo-Indians, who had greeted Sir W. Hunter's references to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji with shouts of "Oh, oh!" Finally he warned Mr. Bhownaggree against "the triumvirate who call themselves the Bombay Presidency Association" and "the gentleman who writes in the name of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha." Poor Lord Harris! He merits, after all, compassion rather than indignation. He spoke like an angry schoolboy. He had been nettled, no doubt, by the fact that, in Sir Roper Lethbridge's speech proposing his health, it was the references to the cricketer, not the statesman, that were cheered. It will be a long time before Lord Harris is invited to preside again at a banquet "of a strictly non-party character." He can hardly have pleased Mr. Bhownaggree, for he went out of his way to remind the only Indian member of Parliament, not once, but many times, that his knowledge was limited to a single part, and a small part, of India, and that he would be expected on all occasions to follow the lead and repeat the formulas of those heaven-born Anglo-Indians who condescend to adorn, and not infrequently to address, the House of Commons.

One word more, and I have done with this extraordinary "function." Lord George Hamilton was not able to be present but he sent a letter—just as, on a former and notorious occassion, he sent a letter to Accrington. In the course of his letter, Lord George Hamilton wrote, with reference to Mr. Bhownaggree:—

> "I feel confident that his advocacy of the views of his fellow-countrymen will be the more successful in the House of Commons, inasmuch as he does not associate himself with those who wish to destroy and revolutionize the organic institutions of his country."

For a dinner "of a strictly non-party character," this, also, was pretty good. But who are "those who wish to destroy," etc.? Will the Secretary of State kindly name?

The indignation aroused in Western India by rumours of the displacement of Mr. Justice Budrudin Tyabji from the bench of the High Court by a young stranger from Allahabad was happily dissipated by the confirmation of Mr. Tyabji's appointment, on November 6th. Yet the appointment of Mr. Arthur Strachey to that bench still stands out as a strange piece of patronage—apparently one of Lord George Hamilton's first little jobs. It seems that the selection of a young barrister of less than a dozen years' standing is regarded as a flagrant act of injustice to Mr. M. H. Starling, who for some five and twenty years has been a hard-working and highly respected member of the Bombay Bar. He has thrice acted as a Judge of the High Court from which he is displaced in deference, it would appear, to the wishes of a certain circle to console Sir John Strachey for his too long deferred retirement from the India Council. Mr. Starling had just presided as Judge in a great criminal case, his conduct of which fully confirmed all that had previously been known as to his fitness for the position. Besides having been three times called upon to fill a vacancy on the Bench he has twice been Advocate-General, and in each case has had to return his briefs and fees, thereby impairing the practice secured during many arduous years of exile. Not only all the Anglo-Indian Bar but the citizens of Bombay regard Mr. Strachey's appointment as a slight upon independent professional Europeans in India. No doubt Sir John Strachey's son may be as good as other men of his year of call, and he has had a few years' experience at the Bar of the North-West Provinces. But it is felt that his being thus early pitchforked into so prominent a position reminds people of the nepotism in the days of the old Company.

The members of the London Indian Society have presented the following address to Mr. Budrudin Tyabji, congratulating him upon his appointment as a judge of the High Court of Bombay:—

> "We, the President and the Members of the London Indian Society, consisting of Indian gentlemen now residing in the United Kingdom, beg to approach you with this address expressive of the great gratification with which we have learnt of your appointment, by Her Majesty the Queen-Empress as judge of the High Court of Bombay.
>
> "It is a matter of special gratification for us to feel that Her Majesty's choice should have fallen, not only upon an Indian gentleman, but one so well qualified by his learning and experience at the Bar, and above all by his generous sympathies with all classes of Her Majesty's subjects in India, and one who has done so much to help the cause of administrative reform in that country as yourself.
>
> "We note with peculiar satisfaction that, by reason of your breadth of views on all questions affecting the progress of India, your appointment has been received with acclamation, not only by the Muhammadan subjects of Her Majesty in India, but by all classes of persons who do not belong to the community of which you are so distinguished a representative.
>
> "We beg to conclude with the expression of our hope that you may long continue to discharge the responsible and onerous duties of your office, with credit to yourself and satisfaction to all the subjects of Her Majesty in the Bombay Presidency."

The address is signed, on behalf of the members of the London Indian Society, by the President, Mr.

Dadabhai Naoroji, and the Secretary, Mr. J. R. Kaderbhoy.

A Bombay correspondent writes: "Lord Sandhurst held another meeting of the Legislative Council at Poona on September 27th. The chief business before the Council was the second reading of the Civil Courts Act Amendment Bill. This was not important, but it has of late been generally felt that the occasions for holding a Council meeting are so few and far between that the opportunity of putting interpellations to Government on urgent administrative questions too rarely occurs. This was especially a subject of complaint under the late Governor's *régime*. The additional members had good reason, therefore, to be grateful to Lord Sandhurst for the opportunity recently given them of calling the attention of Government to some of the most pressing questions. It showed Lord Sandhurst's desire to afford explanations on many points, and the reasons and principles which guided Government in their policy. The questions indicated care, industry, and a sense of responsibility on the part of their authors. As a daily local paper justly remarks, 'so long as these indications exist that the principle underlying the right of interpellation is understood on both sides, the exercise of the right will serve a most useful purpose in giving honourable members an opportunity of bringing grievances to notice and at the same time affording a suitable medium to Government for disarming such criticism as arises from an incorrect or imperfect knowledge of administrative events.'

"The questions put ranged over a variety of subjects, though they were restricted to topics which required serious notice from Government, or in respect of which public opinion as against the policy and action of Government was more or less pronounced. For instance, the question how to deal with dacoities and disorders by the Berads in the Belgaum district has of late attracted attention. These dacoits apparently need to be put down with a strong hand. There is naturally much public curiosity as to the action that Government has adopted to suppress them. It was, accordingly, satisfactory to know, from Mr. Birdwood's answer to Mr. Javerilal U. Yajnik, that Government was fully alive to the serious nature of these dacoities, and was taking steps to put down the lawlessness of the forest tribes. A further question on the same subject went to show that these dacoits were driven to acts of violence by extreme poverty and want of honest means of livelihood, and suggested the necessity of relief works to alleviate their sufferings. Mr. Birdwood, however, declined to accept this theory. Doubtless Government is guided in the measures it adopts by the opinion of the local district officers. With regard to the riots at Dhulia, which resulted from the playing of music before mosques, and the settlement of the music question by the appointment of a mixed Commission of Enquiry, questions were put both by Mr. P. M. Mehta and Mr. Javerilal. But nothing could be more evasive than the replies of Mr. Birdwood. On this point the *Bombay Gazette* remarks: 'We believe public opinion will favour an enquiry, after the trial is over, as to where the responsibility rests for the action of the Bhil troops in firing on the crowd, and as to the extent to which this extreme course was demanded by the exigencies of the situation.'

"It is much to be regretted that, though important questions are put by honourable members, no improvement is perceptible in the general mode of answering them. Mr. Birdwood, the judicial and political member, is decidedly more courteous, but his answers are not full. At all events, the Council does not seem to be a bit the wiser for the information supplied by him. Mr. Nugent, the revenue and financial member, is more defiant and haughty. In his answers he seems to suggest that he is the autocrat of the Council table. Most of his answers may be summarised in one or other of the following phrases:—

(1) The subject is under the consideration of Government;
(2) Government declines to give the information asked for;
(3) Government sees no necessity for any action;
(4) The attention of Government has not been drawn to the matter;
(5) The honourable member is referred to the answer previously given;
(6) The matter is confidential;
(7) Reports have been called for, and will be laid on the table;
(8) Government is not prepared to give an opinion on the matter;
(9) Financial difficulties prevent Government from taking the proposed steps;
(10) Government reserves to itself the right of referring to the subject or not in its resolution on the point;

—and so on. We leave it to the reader to judge for himself whether public interests could possibly be advanced by this mode of answering questions."

Sir Auckland Colvin contributes to the *Nineteenth Century* for November a valuable article, to which we hope to return on a future occasion, upon "Indian Frontiers and Indian Finance." It is a sequel to his article, printed some twelve months ago, upon the perilous growth of Indian Expenditure, and, while it sets out with admirable clearness the present position of the Indian finances, it indicates the extent and duration of the future strain which the "forward" policy promises to produce. The conclusions which Sir Auckland Colvin demonstrates with unanswerable force are the conclusions which have been consistently put forward by independent public opinion in India and by non-official critics of Indian affairs in this country. "Frontier policy and Indian finance are," writes this eminent financial expert, "as inseparable as foreign policy and finance in Western countries. There can be no improvement in Indian finance so long as Indian revenues are depleted by the claims of frontier extension or exposed to the risk and requirements of war."

Opposition to the "forward" policy is described by some wiseacres as the "old-fashioned view." Sir Auckland Colvin is not ashamed of the epithet :—

> "The 'old-fashioned' view has been indicated in the course of this paper, and in the words of its first and greatest exponent. It is the old-fashioned view to 'seek to put limits to expenditure.' It is the old-fashioned view to 'protest against the necessity of having to impose additional taxation on the people of India, who are unwilling as it is, to bear such pressure even for measures which they can both understand and appreciate.' It is the old-fashioned view to 'look for our true policy, our strongest security, in the contentment, if not in the attachment, of the masses, in husbanding the finances of India, and in consolidating and multiplying its resources.' If in India, where most responsibility lies, these views are no longer in favour, let us learn why they have been discarded, and what are the views by which they have been replaced. If, on the other hand, their importance is still admitted, let us be told how they are to be made consistent with the present forward policy. Economy, the contentment of our Indian fellow-subjects, and multiplying the resources of British India may be merely the old-fashioned views of the India Office, of retired officers, of dead viceroys, and of other unconsidered obscurities. But they are, at least, the views which in building up India in the past guided the great men who were charged with the task, and which enabled them to hand over the India of the present day, such as we still see it, to the men who are now responsible."

These weighty words, coming from the source they do, should surely check the mad career of the party of aggression. We commend them especially to the notice of the Lancashire politicians who find the burden of the cotton duties so grievous to bear.

We reproduce on another page some of the most important passages from an article contributed by Dr. G. W. Leitner to the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, upon the results of the "forward" policy. One result of the Durand Treaty is, it appears, to hand over Kafiristan to the Amír—in other words, to sanction the enslavement of her people and the extinction of their independence. This is indeed a remarkable performance for the British Government to have achieved, and surely it need only be brought to the knowledge of the public in order to be promptly reversed. Already an appeal, which is to be submitted to the learned societies, has been prepared on the subject. The appeal has been signed by the President of the Anthropological Institute and other representative scholars in the interests of their respective branches of learning, the Secretaries of the Aborigines Protection Society, the Peace Society, and the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, as well as Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., on behalf of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress.

Fidus.

OUR SCIENTIFIC FRONTIER.[1]

Chitral, its expedition and its occupation, may yet prove a "blessing in disguise" to India, for it has served to call attention in an unprecedented manner to the fatuous policy of which it is the latest fruit. No apology is needed for returning to a subject of such burning interest. Unlike most other questions of Imperial Policy, the retention of Chitral has not been, and ought never to be, accepted silently as a *fait accompli*. No speech of importance delivered since the prorogation of Parliament has omitted reference to it, either in the way of attack or apology, and Mr. Balfour's speech at Glasgow was no exception to the rule. He professed to sum up the arguments against the retention of Chitral under four heads:—(1) That its retention would displease Russia; (2) that it would cause an augmentation of the Indian Army; (3) that it would add greatly to the expense of Indian administration; (4) that it was unfair to the independent tribes. The first argument is certainly not one which would commend itself to any except a Russophobist, and for that title the opponents of the "forward" policy can scarcely be said to be qualified. We concur in Mr. Balfour's reply that Russia "did not consider the Chitral affair any 'business of hers,'" so far as the phrase implies merely the absence of Russian disapproval. It would be absurd, of course, to shut one's eyes to the fact that two great powers like England and Russia, both engaged in the formation of world-empires, must find their interests clash from time to time. But it is not on the Indian frontier that the danger must be looked for. So long as Russia can, by demonstrations on the borders of Afghanistan, provoke the Simla authorities into hysterical and feverish action among the wild tribes of the mountains, where so much blood and treasure have been poured out in vain, her interests are fully served. She naturally, therefore, views our proceedings in Chitral with nothing but secret satisfaction, for British pre-occupation in Central Asia leaves her hands free for much more important work in the Far East. The second argument Mr. Balfour meets by a flat denial. That denial must be taken for no more than it is worth. It need only be said here that ease and cheapness have been constantly claimed, in the face of facts, as among the advantages of a "forward" policy. Yet, to quote only one instance, the occupation of the valleys between the Indus and Quetta, which followed the Penjdeh incident in 1885, necessitated, within the next three years, the addition of 30,000 men to the frontier forces. These were augmented to that extent by the calling out of 19,000 reserves and the addition of 11,000 natives to the establishment. The third argument Mr. Balfour dismisses with the remark that the expense of administration is insignificant. What is insignificant in a rich country may be of the utmost significance in a tax-burdened and poverty-stricken land like India, and experience has shown us, as Lord Salisbury himself admits, that insignificant Government estimates have a constant tendency to be exceeded by the actual expenditure; else how comes it that, in the petty warfares of the last fifteen years, some thirty millions of India's money have been squandered, with hardly a protest in Parliament? The reply to the fourth argument is worthy of Mr. Balfour, the politician, and unworthy of the keen, destructive thinker he shows himself to be in his academic addresses and philosophical works. He attaches great importance to petitions for incorporation with the British empire presented by the tribes in the Chitral district. Is it possible that Mr. Balfour really believes any weight can be attached to such petitions after hearing Sir Henry Fowler's quotations on September 3rd from Dr. Robertson's report of 1893, in which the venality and the fickleness of these tribes are described? If so, he must be supposed to outdo even the philosopher Hume in the ease with which his mind assumes in practice everything it denies in theory. Cynicism, it is to be feared, rather than guilelessness, has led him into an exposure of the canting hypocrisy which has served from time immemorial to cloak military aggression. Far from enviable must appear to every honest man the state of mind of the cynic who can, like Mr. Balfour, unblushingly talk of justice and equity as the basis of a "prestige" to maintain which the occupation of Chitral is alleged to be necessary in violation of the published proclamation that preceded the expedition. "Thus," he said, in conclusion, melodramatically, amid the cheers of the Glasgow Tories, "do I sweep away the "arguments which have been urged against the "retention of Chitral." But we fear these arguments refuse to be thus swept away, as Mr. J. Dacosta proves anew in an article which will be found upon another page.

---

[1] "Indian Problems," No. 2. "India's Scientific Frontier: Where is It? What is It?" Col. H. B. Hanna. (Constable and Co.)

Colonel Hanna, in the second of his tracts on Indian Problems has provided ample material for the refutation of every argument—political, military, and "moral"—that can be adduced in favour of the "forward" policy. He has traced historically the development of that policy, with the origin of the catchword "scientific frontier," the disasters it has brought upon us in the past, and the situation with which its votaries have brought us face to face in the present. The term "scientific frontier" relies for its meaning, if meaning it has, on the military doctrine that the value of an obstacle depends on the power of the defending force to operate on either side of the obstacle at will. The desire for the formation of a new frontier which should fulfil these conditions proceeded from what Lord Sandhurst called "Brevet-Mania" or "K.C.B., Mania," an epidemic common amongst military officers, who, under its influence, have abandoned the true scientific frontier which nature has provided in the deserts that border on the Indus, and have gone in search of it in the trackless mountains beyond. Fifty years ago the "forward" policy was urged; though its great popularity in recent years dates only from Lord Beaconsfield's fatal invention of the catchword "scientific frontier." Once the Indus is left behind, no frontier satisfactory from a military point of view can be found South of the Hindu Kush, and that frontier could not be safely defended without such expenditure on lines of communication and such an increase of the Indian army as would ruin both India and England. The advance has gone on from point to point, each new position proves untenable except as a mere step to some distant goal, and the unavowed aim of the "forward" policy is clearly the complete occupation of Afghanistan. The attempt to secure a footing in Afghanistan cost us the war of 1840 to 1842, with the destruction of a whole army in the Khaiber Pass, and the war of 1878 to 1880, with the massacre at Kabul and the disaster at Maiwand. British agents have been stationed at Kabul and "points of observation" secured beyond the Indus to enable us to keep watch on Russia's action in Central Asia—with the result that, as before, the only reliable information received at Calcutta comes by the outward mail, and the ostensible purpose of numerous costly expeditions has failed, as so many Viceroys, Commanders-in-Chief, Governors of the Punjab, and Commissioners declared it would fail. After the severe check in 1840-2 the policy of aggression was suspended, but when the sufferings of those years were forgotten longing eyes were cast once more on the Bolan Pass, and the unfortunate advent of Lord Salisbury to power as Indian Secretary, in 1874, followed by the appointment of Lord Lytton as Viceroy in 1876, brought about the occupation of Quetta in the latter year, and the disastrous war of 1878-80. The Russian feint at Penjdeh in 1885 caused a panic that must have filled the hearts of her diplomatists with gleeful amusement. The valleys around Quetta were seized, its fortifications extended, and the building of railways and road-making pushed on with great vigour. From 1880 to the present time a series of petty wars, costing the Indian taxpayer about two millions per annum, has been waged on the frontier; Waziristan has been reduced to submission by "the ordinary "methods of the blowing up of towers and seizure "of grain and cattle," in punishment for the resentment of the Waziris at the presence of a British force in their territory; and "an excuse for occupying Chitral was provided by the simple but costly "expedient of sending a British officer with a small "escort on a temporary mission, allowing him to "remain there after the purpose for which he had "been sent was accomplished, and then, when at "last his safety had been endangered by an outbreak of the civil strife usually raging in that "country, by despatching an army to his rescue."

Such is the policy of a "scientific frontier" and such are its fruits. What is the resultant military and political situation at the present time? Since 1876, an area of 76,500 square miles, with a fighting strength estimated by Lord Roberts at nearly a quarter of a million, has been added to the Indian empire. The Quetta district, over 43,000 square miles in area, is garrisoned by 9,000 men; in Waziristan 6,000 square miles are held by 2,500 men; the Gilghit district, 23,000 square miles of wild and inaccessible country, is manned by 3,200 men. The proportion of native to English troops in Quetta is 4½ to 1. In Gilghit and Waziristan there is not a single British soldier. Nor are the native troops solely those whose fidelity has been proved. They are largely recruited from the tribes whose territories have been invaded, and who must of necessity be hostile at heart. British occupation can do literally nothing to promote prosperity in these barren districts, while it deprives the inhabitants of their chief delight — fighting and plundering. Time after time the treachery of these Pathan levies has been proved. Our deserters are with the independent tribes, their spies in our camp. They are learning our discipline and tactics, and will only require leaders to prove most dangerous foes. Left in undisturbed possession of their lands, and merely subsidised, they would prove an almost insurmountable obstacle in the path of any foreign power that interfered with their freedom in order to force a passage into India. Coerced by the presence of a British force, they cannot fail to welcome the intrusion of an invader, which would enable them to gratify at once their vengeance and their desire for plunder. At present our garrisons occupy most precarious positions, scattered up and down the country. In the event of a sudden rising, promoted perhaps by foreign agents anxious to occupy our attention and tie our hands, they must either be cut off and await release by an expedition in force, or, if forewarned, concentrate on the central position. The chief of these, Quetta, lies 257 miles from the Indus, and is connected with Sibi by three lines of railway constructed at great expense in the face of stupendous engineering difficulties. Of these one is shortly to be given up. One of the other two is in places periodically swept away by the torrents, which interrupt communication for periods varying from a few days to a couple of months. The third, not yet completed, has been delayed a year partly by the falling in of tunnels, and is evidently liable to the same interruptions as the other two. Thus our "great stronghold," Quetta, would in all likelihood prove useless in the remote event of a foreign invasion by the Bolan Pass, while, even if we assume the maintenance of connexions with its base to be possible, its chief value is recognised by candid military authorities to lie in its situation on the road to Kandahar and Herat. Unless England is prepared to occupy Afghanistan in such force as to defy both Russians and Pathans, her position is indefensible on any grounds. By her present attitude she enables Russia to irritate and annoy her at any time without the expense of an organised expedition; she encourages discontent in India; and, by exposing her troops to the risk of isolation in the mountains of Afghanistan, she tempts discontent to vent itself in risings which the presence of her troops in the valley of the Indus would render impossible.

And all to what purpose? Colonel Gerard, who would be more than human if he minimised the importance of the Pamir delimitation from which he has recently returned, nevertheless states confidently his opinion that invasion in that quarter is impossible, and that Russia's designs in Central Asia are mainly commercial. The fear of Russia is admittedly, then, a nightmare. Even Mr. Balfour's words justified, as we have said above, a similar inference. This being so, our frontier policy, always devoid of reason, lacks even pretext, and stands forth in naked impudence as the offspring of an unbridled passion for military glory. It would have been an inestimable boon to India and England both, if the electors who returned the Salisbury Government to power this year could have previously read and studied Colonel Hanna's tracts, the third of which will be awaited with keen interest. It might then have been prophesied, not unreasonably, that the Indian Secretary who decided on the occupation of Quetta in 1876 would not become the Premier of 1895, who has dared to reverse the policy of his immediate predecessors. One certain method of securing a due measure of public attention to the matter would be to saddle the Imperial Exchequer with purely Imperial Expenditure. Dare the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure suggest so equitable a reform?

THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE IN INDIA.

"INTERVIEW" WITH MR. MANOMOHAN GHOSE.

The demand for the separation of judicial and executive functions has long been urged, not only by the Indian National Congress, but also by Anglo-Indians, without distinction of political party. But the demand still remains unsatisfied, and, indeed, complaints are now frequent in India that the endeavours of the Executive to interfere with the independence of the Judiciary, far from ceasing, are becoming more common and more systematic. It was these complaints (writes a representative of India) that led me to seek an "interview" with the distinguished Calcutta barrister, Mr. Manomohan Ghose, who is at present staying in London with his family. Nobody is more amply qualified than Mr. Ghose to express an opinion as to the extent and the gravity of the evil, which has long been condemned in vain. He was the first Hindu from India to be called to the Bar in England. He gained this distinction in 1866, at Lincoln's Inn, and since 1867 he has practised in Calcutta, chiefly, of late, in criminal cases. Mr. Ghose, whose sympathies are with reform, is a strong supporter of the Indian National Congress. In 1892 he was prevented only by domestic affliction from presiding over its meetings at Allahabad. I found him eager to discuss the burning question of the Judiciary and the Executive. His personal experience, as he was careful to explain, is for the most part confined to Bengal. But he has, he added, good reason to believe that his remarks apply generally to the whole of India.

Mr. Ghose replied, of course, to my general question as to the administration of justice in India, that he believed that "justice was never better administered, and that life and property were never more secure in the history of India than they are at the present moment. Even the masses of the people in Bengal with whom I come daily into contact have learnt," he said, "to appreciate the blessings of a pure administration of justice; and I believe further that the loyalty and contentment of the people in Bengal are mainly due to this appreciation on their part."

"And have they taken kindly to the English system?" I asked.

"They have taken very kindly to it, and, on the whole, it deals out even justice between man and man. But, unfortunately, there are certain disturbing elements which impair the efficiency of our Courts, and lead at once to gross miscarriages of justice. In civil cases, as between one Indian and another, I may say that justice seldom miscarries, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that in such cases one seldom hears of any injustice consciously perpetrated by a judge of any grade. No doubt mistakes are sometimes committed, and even when they cannot be rectified by a higher court they do not cause nearly so much mischief as acts of injustice deliberately done, whether willingly or under pressure of some sort. But I regret to say that the course of justice does not always go evenly when racial considerations are involved. In criminal cases, especially, the racial element frequently leads to gross miscarriage of justice. This, however, is an extremely difficult and delicate matter, for which I will not undertake at present to suggest any remedy, beyond expressing a hope that the cultivation of a better feeling between the European and Indian races may lead to an improvement in this respect. But the cause which more frequently leads to miscarriage of justice is one which it is in the power of the Government or the Legislature to rectify if it chooses, and that is the combination of judicial and executive functions in one officer."

Wanted: Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions.

"And has not this system been condemned by many eminent authorities?"

"Yes, it has. I have collected the opinions of several eminent Anglo-Indian authorities, ranging over a period of nearly forty years, condemning this system and advocating separation. Only recently, in a debate in the House of Lords, over the Maimansingh case, both Lord Kimberley, then Secretary of State, as well as Lord Cross, his predecessor, expressed the opinion that it was exceedingly desirable, in the interests of justice, to separate the two functions. But no step, I regret to say, has been seriously taken to effect this separation. Lord Kimberley remarked that financial considerations prevented the Government from introducing this much-needed reform. I am sorry that I do not appreciate the force of this objection. As my friend, Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, C.I.E., of the Bengal Civil Service, now Commissioner of the Orissa Division, has shown, the reform could be carried out without costing an additional rupee to the State. Although Lord Kimberley had been advised that Sir Richard Garth was wrong in stating that the principal ground of objection to this reform was an apprehension on the part of executive officers in India that their prestige would suffer by it, I cannot help saying that, on the contrary, I am convinced, from what I have seen, heard, and read, that Sir Richard Garth was perfectly right in his assertion, and that the financial objection is merely put forward in the present embarrassed state of Indian finances in order to shelve the question."

"Perhaps it would be well, Mr. Ghose, if you would first describe concisely, for the information of English readers, the Indian legal system on its criminal side?"

"Well, I may tell you that, except in the Presidency towns of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, where there are Presidency Magistrates, somewhat analogous in position to your Police Magistrates in London, all petty criminal cases are tried by three classes of magistrates in India, known as the first, second, and third class magistrates. All these magistrates in a district are subordinate to the District Magistrate, who is the chief executive officer of the district, and who hears appeals from the decisions of second and third-class magistrates only. Appeals, where they are admissible, from decisions of first-class magistrates, including those of the District Magistrate himself, lie to the District Judge, who is subordinate only to the High Court. As regards the power of these magistrates, I ought to tell you that the first-class magistrate is competent to award a sentence of two years' rigorous imprisonment (what you call 'hard labour') and a fine of Rs 1,000; a second-class magistrate is empowered to inflict six months' rigorous imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 200; and a third-class magistrate can inflict one month's imprisonment and a fine of Rs. 50. It is the District Magistrate who determines, according to the schedule of offences in the code of criminal procedure, to which class of magistrate any given case is to be made over. As regards the more heinous cases, which, by the Code of criminal procedure, cannot be tried by magistrates, they are committed to the Court of Sessions of the district, where the Sessions Judge tries the case with the aid of two assessors whose opinions he may or may not follow, or with the aid of a jury whose verdict prevails unless the Judge differs from it and thinks fit to refer the case for the orders of the High Court. The assessors are, in each case, selected by the Judge himself from a list prepared by the Magistrate of the district and by the Judge. The jury are selected by lot out of those summoned to attend on a particular day. The Sessions Judge otherwise called the District Judge, in all trials has the power of sentencing the accused to transportation for life, or to death. But in the latter case the sentence has to be confirmed by the High Court. I ought to add that the High Court has power to call up and revise the record 'of all criminal' cases, whether the sentence passed is appealable or not, and this power of revision by the High Court is a most important and salutary one, and the very existence of it, even though seldom exercised, except on questions of law, has a wholesome effect upon the entire judiciary of the country."

"Am I right in saying that at present the most important question which affects the whole administration of criminal justice in India has to do with endeavours on the part of the Government to make the Judiciary practically subservient to the Executive?"

"Yes, you are quite right. There has been for some time past in Bengal a tendency to force the Judiciary to decide criminal cases according to the preconceived ideas of the Executive, and this tendency, I am sorry to find, has gone so far as to lead the Local Government to assert the right of criticising the judgments even of the Judges of the

High Court, who are in no way subordinate to the Local Government. As regards the Judges and the Magistrates in the interior, attempts have been made in various ways in recent years to put pressure upon them to make their decisions accord with the views entertained by the Executive. The Executive are naturally anxious that no slur should be cast upon the police by Judges and Magistrates and, with that view, of late years, the Executive officers in Bengal have had recourse to various methods, all tending to interfere with the judicial independence of Judges and Magistrates."

I.—THE SUBORDINATE MAGISTRATES.

"Will you tell me what those methods are?"

"In the olden days the Executive were in the habit of loyally accepting the decisions of judicial tribunals. But within the last twenty years there has been a manifest tendency to put pressure upon our judicial tribunals to decide cases in accordance with the wishes of the Executive. This pressure is frequently put in an indirect way. Judges and magistrates have to look up to the Executive for promotion and preferment, and if their decisions are subjected to criticism by the Executive, such as the magistrate of the district, the Commissioner of the division, or an under-secretary to the Government, it must impair the feeling of independence which every judicial officer ought to possess. This is not, however, the only way in which the judicial independence of our officers is threatened. A Deputy-Magistrate has to depend entirely upon the District Magistrate for his promotion. The District Magistrate combines in himself executive and judicial functions. In his Executive capacity—often on an *ex parte* hearing—he comes to the conclusion, for example, that a certain person is obstructive and ought to be criminally punished, should an opportunity for punishing him offer itself. Such an opportunity may, in Bengal, occur at any moment. When a case does occur in which that unfortunate man is involved, the District Magistrate will probably, for fear of an application to the High Court for a transfer from his file, or for the purpose of showing apparent impartiality, refrain from trying it himself, but will make it over to a subordinate Deputy-Magistrate with an expression of opinion—more frequently verbal than in writing—that the man ought to be convicted. The Deputy-Magistrate, who is naturally anxious to be in the good books of the District Magistrate, has not often the courage to acquit the man, even if he should judicially come to the conclusion that the man ought to be acquitted. I remember a case in which I moved for a transfer of a criminal case from a Deputy-Magistrate's file, on the ground that the District Magistrate had written a letter to his deputy suggesting that the *maximum* sentence should be given to the prisoner. I secured the transfer because my client was lucky enough to have obtained a copy of the letter. Such instances are, I believe, of almost daily occurrence, but many of them do not see the light of day; and if the suggestions or instructions are verbal, they cannot be proved."

"How, then, do you know that they are given?"

"Many Deputy-Magistrates who are my personal friends have frequently complained that they are subject to this kind of interference, and that they have had quietly to submit to it. Whenever I have succeeded in exposing a District Magistrate who has acted in this way, it has been said on his behalf—sometimes even by High Court judges from the bench—that this was inevitable by reason of the combination of judicial and executive functions in the person of the magistrate. I know of many instances in which what are called demi-official 'chits' in India have been sent by the District Magistrate during the progress of a case to a subordinate magistrate engaged in trying it, telling him how to proceed in matters which are purely judicial."

"And what are demi-official 'chits?'"

"By demi-officials 'chits' I mean slips of paper sent officially but privately, and these do not form part of the record of a case, nor are they accessible to the Appellate Court or to the parties. I have known instances in which District Magistrates have openly asserted the right to give any advice they think proper to their subordinate magistrates engaged in trying cases. In one notable instance a covenanted English magistrate openly told me in Court that he would consult the District Magistrate, who was practically the prosecutor in the case, as to a particular matter which he was then called upon to decide judicially. This he said with great simplicity, and apparently without even knowing that it was in any way objectionable to be advised by the prosecutor in the case. This is how, ordinarily, the independence of subordinate magistrates is interfered with. The practice has to my knowledge existed, so far as the subordinate magistrates are concerned, during the last thirty years. The Commissioner of the division, who is a purely executive officer above the District Magistrate, also asserts and exercises the right of censuring magistrates as regards their judicial work.

"Can you give me an instance?"

"Oh, yes; I remember a well-known case in which a Deputy Magistrate showed me an autograph private letter, written to him by the Commissioner of the Division, in which the latter officer expressed disapprobation of a particular judgment which the magistrate had delivered, and in which he further went on to say that in consequence of that judgment the Lieutenant-Governor had stopped the magistrate's future promotion for a term of years. The Deputy Magistrate showed me the letter with fear and trepidation, and begged me not to make any use of it, adding 'see how unfortunate I am. The Government treats me in this way although my judgment has, on revision, been affirmed by the High Court'. This state of things must, I fear, continue so long as the Chief Executive officer of the district continues to exercise appellate as well as revisional powers over subordinate magistrates. The District Officer, who is in constant private and official communication with the Superintendent of Police, is often influenced one way by the *ex parte* representations and reports of the police, while the subordinate magistrate who hears the evidence and deals judicially with the case, forms an opinion the other way; and it is not every officer who has, under these circumstances, the strength of mind to resist the temptation of surrendering his own judgment to that of his official superior whose approbation it is his interest to seek."

"Can you give me a typical instance of the evil of which you complain?"

"I can give you from my own experience numerous cases which have come under my notice; but I will select, for the present, only one case, which occurred during the administration of the present Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, Sir Charles Elliott. It will show the extent to which even the Government may go in this respect. A few years ago I was called upon to defend two Bengali gentlemen who had been charged by the police with assaulting them in the execution of their duty. They had, on the other hand, complained against the police for having grossly assaulted and maltreated them without any cause. The case brought by the police was heard by a magistrate in whose court I was able to show conclusively that the charge preferred by the police was utterly false and supported by fabricated evidence. Before the magistrate had delivered his judgment, the policeman who was the complainant came to me and confessed to me that he had been put up to prefer a false charge by his superior officers. He said that he was extremely sorry for what he had done, and begged me to withdraw the counter-charge which my clients had brought against him. I told him that I could not advise him as to what to do in such a matter, but that he should be guided by the advice of his official superiors. He and his official superior then came to me, and expressed their readiness to apologise to my clients for what the police had done. Acting under my advice, my clients withdrew the charge against the police on receipt of an apology by the policemen concerned. But, before this, the magistrate had acquitted my clients and declared that the case against them was false. Shortly afterwards, the head of the police department, knowing nothing of the confession and the apology on the part of the offending policemen, made a report against the magistrate to the Government, and prayed that the case against my clients might be re-opened, as the magistrate had improperly acquitted them. The Government of Bengal found it impossible to re-open the case in any way, although it had the power under the law to appeal against the acquittal to the High Court. But instead of proceeding in the only way the law allowed, a Secretary to the Government sent for the magistrate and expressed to him the grave disapprobation of the Lieutenant-Governor for the judgment he had delivered. When the magistrate declared that he had acted to the best of his judgment according to the evidence, the Secretary, I am told, remarked, 'You ought to have thrown the responsibility of acquitting the men on the Appellate Court!' My authority for this communication is the magistrate himself. Recently, a circular has been issued by some magistrates—I believe, with the full approval of Sir C. Elliott—in which subordinate magistrates are requested not to comment adversely in their judgments upon the conduct of the police concerned in any case, but to report their conduct departmentally. I need hardly add that this amounts to direct interference with the independence of subordinate magistrates."

II.—THE DISTRICT JUDGES.

"But how about the District Judges? Are not they as a body independent, and do they not enjoy the confidence of the people?"

"I am glad to say that the District Judges as a body are able and conscientious men, and try to do their work according to their lights. This is partly due to the fact that they are practically independent of all Executive control. Their work is subject to revision only by the High Court. But of late years the Government of Bengal has been indirectly trying to interfere with their independence also. There is nobody to send demi-official 'chits' to *them*, but recently several judges have privately complained to me that they have found it very difficult to maintain their independence by reason of the treatment they have received from Executive officers and from the Bengal Government. One of them—an English judge—highly respected in Bengal as an able, conscientious and independent gentleman, told me not long ago that he had made up his mind to retire from the service, chiefly because he had found it very unpleasant to perform his duty conscientiously and with independence. And he has now, quite recently, retired. I believe that this is not a solitary instance in which an English judge has retired for this reason."

"But in what way, exactly, does the Government interfere with the independence of these District Judges?"

"A judge whose verdict or whose decision does not meet with the approval of the District Magistrate is privately reported against to the Government—it may be through the Commissioner of the Division—and the Government has the power of transferring him to any unhealthy station, or of delaying his promotion."

"Can you give me an instance in which this has been done?"

"I can only speak of the general feeling on the subject as the reasons for such transfers are not, of course, publicly announced. But I can give you one instance of a very remarkable character which convinces me that there is a good deal of foundation for this feeling. Not long ago the *Indian Mirror* published an anonymous letter in which the writer gave it as a rumour that a well-known and independent judge of the Civil Service had been recommended by one of Sir Charles Elliott's secretaries for a transfer to Noakhali or some such unhealthy district. The writer professed to give the recommendation of the secretary, together with the remarks of the Lieutenant-Governor himself. The letter was treated by me, as well as by most people, as a hoax. But to my great surprise a few days after the letter had appeared, the editor of the *Indian Mirror* came to see me with a communication from the Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal threatening him with a prosecution under the Official Secrets Act for having given publicity to this anonymous letter—which manifestly, therefore, according to the Government of Bengal, did contain an official secret. It is scarcely necessary to add that, under my advice, the editor replied that the Official Secrets Act had no possible application to the circumstances of the case, even if the information contained in the letter was true. We heard nothing further of this prosecution. But I may remark that, inasmuch as the editor was charged by the Government of Bengal in that letter with being in league with somebody in the Government Secretariat—a charge which the editor indignantly denied—the inference is irresistible that, after all, the information given by the anonymous writer had some basis of fact."

III.—The Judges of the High Court.

"But how about the judges of the High Court? Are they not generally independent of the Executive, and do they not command the confidence of the people?"

"I may say that there is no institution in the country which commands greater respect and confidence from the people than the High Court, and that is because, as a body, the judges are thoroughly independent and conscientious. Those selected from England—viz., barrister judges—are deserving of special mention in this respect, because they are not swayed by prejudices which a long residence in India is apt to foster. As regards the civilian judges of the High Court, I think it my duty to mention also that I have come across judges who, in respect of thorough impartiality and independence, would bear comparison with the best judges in England. But this depends very much upon the class of men who are selected from the Civil Service. I regret to say that there have been men selected from the Civil Service who have, by reason of their tendency to please the Executive, failed to come up to the mark. But they are quite the exception. The judges of the High Court are, I am sorry to say, not looked upon with much favour by the magistracy under them, and the reason of that is not far to seek. The magistrates in the interior are frequently apt, by reason of Executive influence, to deliver judgments not only opposed to law, but not supported by the evidence in the case. No wonder, therefore, that the High Court judges, uninfluenced by Executive considerations, feel it their duty to reverse such judgments, and they thereby cause dissatisfaction among the magistracy, who, whenever their decisions are reversed, have a tendency to consider their prestige utterly gone."

"But has the Executive in any way ever attempted to influence the judges of the High Court?"

"I am sorry to say that I myself could give instances of some such attempts; but, except in rare instances, they have never been successful, because our High Court judges, although holding office during the pleasure of the Crown, are practically not in any way under the control of the Government."

"Has there ever been any friction between the local Government and the High Court?"

"Yes, the whole thing culminated not long ago in a dispute between the judges and Sir Charles Elliott, who has always declared himself opposed to any separation of judicial and executive functions in India. He has been more opposed to this reform than any Lieutenant-Governor I can think of. A few years ago he asserted the right of sitting in judgment upon the judicial work of the Judiciary in Bengal, and this led to a controversy between him and the judges. The judges in a body, with one exception, protested against the attitude assumed by Sir Charles Elliott, and the whole matter was referred to the Secretary of State for his decision. It is a matter of the deepest regret to us that Lord Kimberley, instead of vindicating the independence of our judges, practically shirked the whole question. Such an unseemly conflict between the High Court and the Executive, resulting in so unsatisfactory a manner, is not calculated to enhance the respect which the public ought to have for Her Majesty's judges. Much depends upon the class of men raised to the High Court Bench. The High Court alone, in my opinion, ought to have the power of nominating civilian judges for seats in that Court, and the Barrister judges should, as a rule, be sent out from England; not because there are not competent men in our Bar, but because there is great danger of mediocre and weak men being selected in India as being what are commonly called by the Executive safe men. I say this notwithstanding the fact that recently we have had two excellent and thoroughly independent judges from our own Bar."

"Do you think the policy pursued by Sir Charles Elliott is likely to be discontinued on his approaching retirement?"

"He would probably have retired as a popular Governor from Bengal if he had not made shipwreck by reason of the policy of which I complain and of which he is such a strong advocate. His successor, Sir Alexander Mackenzie, knows Bengal well, and the feeling of the people there on this subject. He is generally credited with sympathy for the people of Bengal, and I have no doubt he will steer clear of the rock upon which his predecessor, known to be a very able man, has made such a sad shipwreck."

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Budrudin Tyabji, barrister-at-law, who now holds the appointment of Acting Judge of the High Court of Bombay, to be a Judge of that Court, in the room of Mr. Justice C. F. Farran, who was recently appointed Chief Justice of the same Court.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. James Acworth Davies, of the Indian Civil Service, and barrister-at-law, who now holds the appointment of Acting Judge of the High Court of Madras, to be a Judge of that Court in the room of Mr. James William Best, who has been permitted to retire.

Dr. G. B. Clark, M.P., a member of the Indian Parliamentary Committee and of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, started on November 21st for India by the *Caledonia*, together with Mr. Caldwell, M.P., Dr. Macgregor, and Mr. and Mrs. Oliver Scatcherd, of Leeds. Dr. Clark and some of the other members of the party may possibly attend the meetings of the Congress at Poona.

Mr. Manomohan Ghose, an "interview" with whom on the subject of judicial and executive functions in India is printed on another page, is at present on a brief visit to London, with his wife and daughter. Mr. Ghose has, during his stay, not only taken an active part in the work of the British Committee, but has also had private conversations with many prominent public men, whose sympathetic interest in Indian affairs may prove invaluable. It would not be easy to over-estimate the importance of the work which Indian gentlemen like Mr. Manomohan Ghose accomplish on behalf of their country in the ordinary intercourse of English society.

Amateurs of the "Divide and Rule" policy in India will do well to ponder the following passage from the speech on the Armenian question delivered by Lord Salisbury at the Guildhall on November 9th: "The reason why I preferred to get rid of the proposal that we should substitute Christian for Moslem officers is that I have a great horror of the Powers of Europe appearing in those countries as the partisans of one religion rather than of the other. It is exceedingly dangerous. Of course, we all of us have our own beliefs; but governing a vast Empire like that which exists under the Queen, we have no other duty than that of absolute impartiality. The Queen is the mistress of more Muhammadans than the Sultan of Turkey—(cheers)—and we should have been neglecting our duty if we had allowed ourselves to appear as the partisans of one religion against the other. What we desired was absolute justice as between man and man for both religions; that both Moslem and Christian, observing each other's rights, might pursue their own industry and follow their own path of prosperity in confidence and in peace."

Nothing is more common in discussions of Indian affairs than for non-official critics to be confronted with so-called "expert" opinion, as if that settled the question at once. Lord Salisbury, in his speech at Brighton on November 20th, incidentally exposed the stupidity of this theory. He said: "Nobody yet knows what the torpedo will do in actual warfare. Nobody yet knows which is the most important—the big ironclad or the swift cruiser. These things can only be decided by experience. You can obtain for any particular opinion any collection of expert authority you wish to get—(hear, hear)—not because expert authority is insincere, but because the human mind is so constituted that a man of great energy and experience always differs from his neighbour who is equally qualified—(hear, hear, and laughter)—and while that difference, that uncertainty exists, while we are in that period of transition our wisdom is to make ourselves so certainly safe that we can look upon any issue of the experiment with indifference." Precisely. But, apparently, Lord Salisbury has not the heart to apply his *caveat* to the Chitral question.

There was another passage in Lord Salisbury's Brighton speech which is hardly less apposite to Indian questions:—"I do not think this generation is sufficiently familiar with the fact that when Mr. Forster proposed this measure (the Education Act) in 1870, he said that in his belief the rate would not exceed threepence in the pound. (Hear, hear.) I should like that statement of his to be written in letters two feet long over every Board school in the country. (Cheers.) You would then have an idea how far you have been led without knowing it, and though I am a minister myself, I must add how little faith you must attach to the plausible calculations of Ministers who desire their plans to be adopted. (Laughter.)" We shall not forget this warning when Mr. Balfour, Lord George Hamilton and others repeat their precious *dictum* that the retention of Chitral will not add a rupee to Indian expenditure. That statement, and the similar statements which have preceded it throughout the history of the "forward" policy, should be written in letters two feet long over the India Office and Downing Street.

The members of the Anglo-Indian Temperance Association met at the Memorial Hall on November 22nd, to welcome to England the Rev. Thomas Evans, their representative in India. An address of welcome was given to Mr. Evans by Mr. W. S. Caine.

At a meeting of the London Indian Society held on November 16th, the following Resolution was unanimously adopted: "That in the opinion of this Society the municipalities in the principal towns of India may be safely entrusted with the control of the Police within their respective jurisdictions." Mr. K. A. Ghaswalla, who moved the resolution, urged that it was an anomaly to withhold from the body entrusted with the care and safety of the town the instruments necessary to their task. Having referred to the powers of such municipalities as Manchester, Birmingham, and Bolton, Mr. Ghaswalla cited continental experience, and quoted the opinion of Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, the Police Commissioner of New York. Mr. Ghaswalla contended that the backbone of municipal reform lay in control of the Police, and that the greater the responsibility which was thrown on the inhabitants the greater their care would be. The control of the Police ought not to be political but civil, not Imperial but municipal.

A "convention" on the Indian cotton import duties was held in the Conservative Club, Manchester, on November 6th, the conveners being the Lancashire and Cheshire Conservative Working Men's Federation. The chair was taken by Mr. H. Seton-Karr, M.P., and amongst those present were Mr. George Whiteley, M.P., Colonel J. J. Mellor, M.P., Mr. B. V. Melville, M.P., Mr. T. Fielden, M.P., Mr. W. E. M. Tomlinson, M.P., Mr. George Kemp, M.P., and Mr. H. Whiteley, M.P. The following resolution was unanimously adopted: "That this meeting of the Lancashire and Cheshire Working Men's Federation, representatives of the textile industries of Lancashire, and others, whilst expressing regret that the Indian import duties on cotton goods were imposed without first taking into consultation the accredited representatives of the cotton trade of Lancashire, respectfully represents to Lord Salisbury's Administration the urgent necessity of such a readjustment of the Indian excise duties as will deprive the import duties of their present protective character, and this meeting presses upon the Government the necessity of entirely abolishing the duties so soon as the financial position of India will permit." The amazing thing is that the Lancashire Tory members who supported this resolution also supported Lord Salisbury's Government in its policy of retaining Chitral.

The Marquis of Lorne, M.P., in the course of a letter of apology for absence, wrote:—"We should I think, make it clear that we desire to help India in her financial difficulties. This should be done, not by giving Bombay a bounty against Lancashire, but by paying from Imperial funds some of the military outlay India has made in the Chitral campaign. We guarantee Indian railroads. Why not help India further on these lines, or by direct assumption of some of her naval and military expenditure? This would fall on all British taxpayers, and not, as the imports duties do, on one trade and one part of the country only. There is no fear that any Viceroy could ever burden on his own responsibility the British Treasury. The telegraph has long since changed the position of the Viceroy, and he and his Government are as much under the control of the Cabinet as is the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland." This is a noteworthy expression of opinion and, if such views are widely held in Lancashire, it might be well for the Lancashire members to embody them in a Memorandum for the information of the Royal Commission on Indian expenditure.

The Blue-book which has just been issued upon the grievances of British Indian subjects in South Africa does not cover the whole series of questions raised by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's deputation to the Colonial Office. It is limited to the Transvaal, and the most important document in it is Mr. Chamberlain's despatch to Sir Hercules Robertson, dated September 4th, expressing regret that Her Majesty's Government are precluded from entertaining the memorials from British Indians forwarded on June 4th.

Mr. Chamberlain's letter, moreover, contains little material addition to the reply which he gave to Mr. Naoroji and his friends. He declines to "go back on the action of either Mr. Stanhope or of Lord Ripon," and he meets the argument that the famous award was void, with the answer that "in this particular arbitration there was 'no reference' in the technical sense." "The matter," Mr. Chamberlain writes, "was, by consent, left to the arbitrator 'at large,' and in the result he disallowed the claims of both sides, giving instead what was his own view of the truth and justice of the matter, as, I apprehend, he was entitled to do. The words quoted in the fourth paragraph of the memorial as constituting the 'reference' are simply those employed in the British case, and, in view of Mr. Searle's waiver, were not binding either on the South African Republic or the arbitrator."

Mr. Chamberlain, in the closing paragraphs of his despatch, regrets that he cannot return "a more encouraging answer," and states that "the petitioners have my sympathy." "I believe them," he says, "to be a peaceable, law-abiding, and meritorious body of persons, and I can only hope that, even as matters stand, their undoubted industry and intelligence, and their indomitable perseverance, will suffice to overcome any obstacles which may now face them in the pursuit of their avocations." Moreover, Mr. Chamberlain reserves to himself "the liberty, later on, to make friendly representations to the South African Republic as to these traders, and possibly to invite that Government to consider whether, when once its legal position has been made good, it would not be wise to review the situation from a new point of view, and decide whether it would not be better, in the interests of its own burghers, to treat the Indians more generously, and to free itself from even the appearance of countenancing a trade jealousy, which I have some reasons to believe does not emanate from the governing class in the Republic."

Commissioner Booth-Tucker of the Salvation Army started for India a fortnight ago, in order to start there a work somewhat related to the "Darkest England" scheme. The number of people in India who live in a chronic state of want is of course very great. The Salvation Army scheme to found peasant settlements is said to be in some measure the result of an appeal issued last year by the Madras Government. The operations of the scheme will be fourfold—peasant settlements, and land agency to facilitate generally the acquisition of lands for the natives, a village loan scheme to combat the usurious money lender, and agricultural schools. It is estimated that after the initial outlay the settlements will be fully self-supporting. In the first place it is proposed to raise a loan of £5,000 for the purpose of starting a settlement of 5,000 acres, which would support 500 families.

It is understood that Mr. Booth-Tucker will endeavour to lay his scheme before the Social Conference at Poona. The difficulties in carrying it out will be, in the first place, to secure waste land in India in plots of sufficient area, and afterwards to find capable shepherds to keep the helpless flocks of peasants together. The plant will need some real root, however small, if it is to develop into a successful colony. In other words, the settlements will need to be in some sort organic, or they will inevitably tend to degenerate, like famine camps, into incoherent masses of helpless people. In the village communities, on the other hand, where local bonds are strong, the Indian peasant has a stable footing.

MR. BALFOUR ON CHITRAL.

Mr. A. J. Balfour, M.P., First Lord of the Treasury, delivered a speech at Glasgow on November 15th, in the course of which he sought to justify the retention of Chitral. This amazing passage, which we discuss elsewhere, was as follows:

> But there is another, not of the same general character, but in which, I am convinced, you are all interested, or would be interested, if the facts were presented to you, which not only followed upon the General Election, but which would not have followed upon that General Election if it had been deferred even for a few weeks. I refer to the abandonment, the proposed abandonment by the late Government, of Chitral. You all remember how Britain thrilled from end to end with the story. You all remember the heroic actions which led to the relief of Chitral some eight or nine months ago. You all remember that the British Army—and in the British Army I include those native soldiers—(hear, hear, and cheers)—fellow-

subjects of ours, who on that day did great work for the Empire of which they are all citizens—you all remember, I say, that the British army displayed those qualities of organisation, of daring, of endurance, of rapidity, all the cardinal virtues which make an army a great fighting machine in a manner which has extorted the praise of those who may not love to see England, to see Britain succeed—(cheers)—and in the heart of every citizen of the Queen sent a glow of pride and of confidence, with the assurance that, after all, we are not worse than our fathers. (Cheers.) Well, that expedition went forth. It did its work, admirably, rapidly, completely. The garrison of Chitral, the residents at Chitral, were relieved, the authority of the Crown was re-established, and the question arose: What should be done with this little State lying at the very outskirits of our Indian Empire under the shadow of the mighty Hindu Kush range? The late Government rashly, hastily, and, as I think, mistakenly—(hear, hear)—decided that it should be abandoned. But the Election came. The resignation, not to say the defeat in the House of Commons, came and in the very nick of time we came into office, and we were able to give the matter further consideration, with the result that we determined that where the British soldier had been there we would remain—(loud cheers)—and that it was not our business, at all events, to retreat. (Cheers.) Lord Rosebery, who was originally responsible for the unfortunate decision to abandon Chitral, has defended that decision since we reversed it; and what does his defence come to? He tells us that the late Government were a very clever set of gentlemen —(laughter)—in which I think he is quite right—(laughter)— and that, being clever, they were also unanimous on the question of the withdrawal. There, again, I do not feel at all disposed to dispute Lord Rosebery's opinion. In the first place, he ought to know whether his colleagues were unanimous or not. In the second place, an event so rare—(laughter)— might readily burn itself into his memory. (Renewed laughter and cheers.) We will, therefore, accept without question his dictum that the late Government on this, at all events, were unanimous. I may incidentally remark that the only point on which—we have it on high authority—the late Government were unanimous, was a point nearly involving discredit on British honour. This able and unanimous body decided that they ought to abandon Chitral. Lord Rosebery said, in speaking to his audience, "You are not in a position to really understand the grounds of this case, because the Blue-book, put forward by the Government is so meagre that in reality the materials for a decision cannot be found within its four corners." Then he went on to say that anybody who had read the debate on Chitral in the House of Commons must have seen that Lord Rosebery's party had the best of it. I do not complain of Lord Rosebery thinking that he got the best of the argument. I do not think politics would be a possible profession unless those who took part in it thought that they had the best of the argument. Therefore, I make no complaint of the views of Lord Rosebery on this subject. But I may respectfully remind him that he thought his party had the best of the argument, and that, with an equal assurance, with a faith not less strong than his, with a conviction which is unshakable, we are of opinion that we got the best of the argument. (Laughter and cheers.) But I think that, in spite of the meagreness of the details contained in the Blue-book of which complaint has been made, I can, in a few sentences, put to you the great arguments for and against this policy of abandonment. What was said in favour of abandonment? It was said, in the first place, that it would displease Russia; it was said, in the second place, it would cause an augmentation of the Indian Army; it was said, in the third place, that it would greatly add to the expense of Indian administration; and it was said, in the fourth place, that it would not be fair upon the independent tribes through whose country the new road to Chitral would require to be made. Well, I will dispose of these four arguments in almost as many sentences. As regards the displeasing of Russia, in the first place it is no affair of Russia's. (Hear.) I say, in the second place, Russia did not pretend it was an affair of hers; I say in the third place, that during the last few months we have been completing the delimitation between the frontiers of the Russian and British influence in that part of the world with that amity, with that full measure of concord, with that total absence of mutual suspicion which befits the relations between two great friendly countries. (Cheers.) Then let me tell you with regard to the second argument, which states that augmentation of the Indian army would be required, that not one single soldier need be added to the Indian army in order to retain Chitral, and that the expense of the operation is one which is absolutely insignificant. As regards the argument which asserts that we should be doing a gross injustice to those independent tribes lying to the north of Peshawar, between Peshawar and Chitral, let me tell you that the result of their contact with the British army and of their further knowledge of British civilization is that they are sending petition after petition—so far they are not granted—that they may be incorporated with the British Empire. (Cheers.) Thus do I sweep away the arguments which have been urged against the retention of Chitral. What are the arguments for it? There are military arguments upon which soldiers, indeed, quarrel, for soldiers will quarrel about anything. There are military arguments, conclusive to my mind, so far as a civilian may venture to pronounce; but beyond the purely military and strategical arguments—the arguments, I mean, that are decided by a look at the map and by a look at the map alone—there are moral arguments which every man acquainted with India, every man acquainted with the East, knows to be overwhelming. (Cheers.) We hold our Empire in India not because our population would justify us—our population, I mean, alone—we hold it because we are looked to by every Indian subject of the Queen as a strong Power which does not retreat, as a Power which loves justice, which gives equity, but which means to be master. (Cheers). That is called prestige. I have heard prestige attacked by men of great name in English politics as a word of shame. I tell you that an empire depends upon its prestige. (Cheers.) I tell you that prestige means to you many battleships and many army corps, and that the day upon which Great Britain loses its prestige is the forerunner of the day upon which Great Britain will lose its Empire. (Cheers.) These are reasons—reasons, let me tell you, agreed in by a body of men not less able and certainly not less unanimous than Lord Rosebery's late Cabinet—(cheers)—I mean the Council of the Governor-General in India—these are reasons which I am sure you will think, as I think, amply justified the course we were enabled to take, because the Election came at the fortunate moment before the unhappy policy of the late Government in this respect was finally accepted. (Cheers.)

THE "APPORTIONMENT OF CHARGE."

SIR GEORGE WINGATE'S OPINIONS IN 1859.

The Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure is appointed to enquire, *inter alia*, into "the apportionment of charge between the Governments of the United Kingdom and of India for purposes in which both are interested." Upon this subject Major (afterwards Colonel Sir George) Wingate, R.E., expressed some valuable opinions in his small book "A Few Words on our Financial Relations with India," published by Messrs. Richardson Brothers in 1859. We cite the following passages which, in view of the recent appointment of Lord Welby's Commission, may almost be said to have been prophetic:—

> There does not seem to be any insuperable difficulty in the way of discovering the principles upon which the financial relations of India with this country should be settled. With reference to its economical effects upon the condition of India, the tribute paid to Great Britain is by far the most objectionable feature in our existing policy. Taxes spent in the country from which they are raised are totally different in their effect from taxes raised in one country and spent in another. In the former case, the taxes collected from the population at large are paid away to the portion of the population

engaged in the service of Government, through whose expenditure they are again returned to the industrious classes. They occasion a different distribution, but no loss of national income, and hence it is, that in countries advanced in civilization, in which the productive powers of man are augmented by mechanical contrivances, and a judicious use of the powers of nature, an enormous taxation may be realised with singularly little pressure upon the community. But the case is wholly different when the taxes are not spent in the country from which they are raised. In this case, they constitute no mere transfer of a portion of the national income from one set of citizens to another, but an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount withdrawn from the taxed country. As regards its effects on national production, the whole amount might as well be thrown into the sea as transferred to another country, for no portion of it will return from the latter to the taxed country in any shape whatsoever. Such is the nature of the tribute we have so long exacted from India. And the burden of a tribute is aggravated in proportion as the tributary country is backward in civilisation, and possesses few mechanical and scientific aids for augmenting its productive power; for the net income of such a country, or the surplus of the gross produce of the nation's industry over and above the quantity required to replace the amount consumed in production, must necessarily be small. A country in the high state of industrial development of our own, could probably pay in tribute one half of its whole taxation more easily than India could pay one-tenth, which was not far from the proportion that the tribute bore to the gross revenues before the outbreak of the mutiny. From this explanation, some faint conception may be formed of the cruel, crushing effect of the tribute upon India. Let the reader endeavour to picture to himself what the present condition of India would have been, had the eighty or ninety millions of Indian taxes, which have been transferred to this country in the present century, been spent in India upon reproductive public works calculated to augment the producing powers of that country. India would long ago have been penetrated in every direction by roads, canals, and railroads. Agricultural produce would by means of the facilities of transit thus afforded, have been drawn from the remotest parts of the interior to the seaboard for export to foreign countries and those regions which now cannot import, because they cannot export, would have become consumers of foreign commodities in exchange for the produce thus sent away. It is probably a poor and inadequate conception to suppose that the net surplus of Indian industry beyond the cost of production, as distinguished from the gross production, would by these means have been doubled or trebled. And as this net surplus forms the fund by means of which a country obtains its imports of foreign commodities, it is not unreasonable to infer that the exports and imports of India, would have been double or treble what they are now. Let the people, and especially the manufacturers of this country, lay it to heart, that but for this cruel and sordid tribute, by which the total annual income of this country has been augmented by two to three [of late years fifteen] millions; our exports [of merchandise] to India, instead of being from ten to sixteen [now about seventy] millions might have been from twenty to fifty [or say one hundred and sixty] millions. For an income of two to three [say fifteen] millions we have sacrificed a trade of ten to twenty-five [eighty to ninety] millions. Let the people of England, and especially the manufacturers of Lancashire, count the cost.

The Indian tribute, whether weighed in the scales of justice or viewed in the light of our own true interest, will be found to be at variance with humanity, with common sense, and with the received maxims of economical science. It would be true wisdom, then, to provide for the future payment of such of the Home Charges of the Indian Government as really form tribute, out of the Imperial Exchequer. These Charges would probably be found to be the dividends on East India stock; interest on Home debt, the salaries of officers and establishments, and cost of buildings connected with the Home Department of the Indian Government; furlough and retired pay to members of the Indian military and civil services, when at home; charges of all descriptions paid in this country, connected with British troops serving in India, except for the purchase of stores to be sent to India; and a portion of the cost of transporting British troops to and from India. In regard to the last item, it would seem to be a fair and most convenient arrangement for the British Government to pay the cost of chartering ships, etc., for the transport of troops to India, and for the Indian Government to bear the cost of sending them home again. In fine, the tribute is made up of such items of charge, connected with the Government of India, as are spent in this country, and for which India receives no material equivalent in any form. In defining the future financial relations of India and Great Britain, it would seem to be a most just and equitable arrangement to require each country to furnish that portion of the total cost of government which is expended within its own limits, and goes to the support of its own industry. Upon this principle, British troops, actually serving in India, would not have to be supported by this country, as in the case of the Colonies, but would be paid by India [as they are now], and only such officers and men of Indian regiments as might happen to be at home would be paid from the British Exchequer.

What appears to be most urgently required is the appointment of a Royal Commission of first-rate men, thoroughly competent to the investigation of economical, political, and moral questions, for the purpose of enquiring into the present financial relations of Great Britain and India, as compared with those of Great Britain and our other dependencies and colonies; and of ascertaining the various items of the Home Charges which may properly be viewed as a tribute paid by India to this country, as well as their total amount since the commencement of the present century; and to report upon the probable effect of this tribute on the condition of India, and the best means of adjusting the financial relations of India and Great Britain for the future, so as to secure the greatest amount of advantage to both countries.

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, DECEMBER, 1895.

TO FRIENDS IN INDIA.

BY A. O. HUME.

"This, then, is the first thing I wish all India to be prepared for: a comparatively early dissolution, the re-entry of the Imperialists into power, and the consequent arrest for a time of all progress in the direction in which we long to travel. Be prepared for this; but when it comes be not disheartened—contain your souls in patience—work on steadily—organise—provide funds for the work in England—never relax your efforts, but keep these ever rigidly within the bounds of loyal constitutional agitation—and rest assured that this time of frost shall not endure for ever, but shall melt away before the rising sun of Democracy which, despite temporary clouds, which more or less obscure and distort it at this its rising, is yet as certain to triumph and dissolve these clouds as anything can be certain in this bewildering world of surprises."

* * * * * * *

"The day of despotisms and bureaucracies is drawing to a close. The day of democracies is opening out. We may have to wait, but we are on the winning side. It is with the rising, not the setting, sun that we have thrown in our lot, and as surely as day follows night so surely shall justice, freedom, and constitutional government replace the existing anachronistic administration, which leaves us so much to deplore. It may linger, but it comes. All progress may for a time seem arrested; but be of good cheer. If only you, the people of India do your duty, India, our beloved India, shall yet be free and happy."—*Speech, Bombay, March*, 1894.

These were some of the words which I addressed to friends in India when leaving them last year. What I therein anticipated has come to pass, and what I now desire is to recall the counsels I then gave, and entreat you to abide by them:—

"*Work on steadily—organise—provide funds for the work in England—never relax your efforts, but keep these ever rigidly within the bounds of loyal constitutional agitation.*"

"*Be of good cheer. If only you, the people of India, do your duty, India, our beloved India, shall yet be free and happy.*"

The long looked for evil day has come; the party opposed to progress and democratic ascendancy is in power, while that friendly to national aspiration and loving justice for its own sake is in a minority, and, for the moment, a hopeless minority. This was all foreseen and expected; and now what are you all doing? Are you working on steadily? Are you organising? Are you providing the requisite funds for the work that ought to be done even now, nay especially now, in England? In a word, are you doing your duty to yourselves, your children, and your country? I greatly fear that in many cases you are doing not as much as you possibly can, but as little as you decently can; that you are more anxious to find excuses for inaction than incitements to activity. Yet perhaps there has never been a time when it was more incumbent on all Indians who love their country to be active, united, bold, and wise. The political party now in power in England is to my notion all that is possible of evil, where politics are concerned, here and in this age. We have not to look far abroad to find much worse public parties, but our Tory party is just as bad as Great Britain at the close of the nineteenth century could be got to tolerate. If she would tolerate anything more objectionable, then probably that party would even be worse than it is now.

With such a party in power, the greatest activity and vigilance on the part of all subject peoples is little short of a condition of existence. There is a large, and, as I hold, evil section of the Indian bureaucracy whose Toryism is too unmitigated for open utterance in England, who are yet ever on the watch in the India Council, in the Government of India, and in all the local Governments, to destroy piecemeal, under the ægis of their kindred now in power, those small liberties you enjoy. They are nibbling at the judiciary, they are tampering with juries, they are whittling down municipal rights, they are whispering about fettering the liberty of the press. Advances to any purpose are not likely under this existing *régime*, and I cannot promise you these as the probable results, under present circumstances, of any amount of activity. But I am compelled to warn you that unless you do exhibit far greater activity, far greater vigilance, and far greater resolution than you seem to have been displaying of late, before England has succeeded in casting from her shoulders that Tory incubus, that Old Man of the Sea, which now dominates her councils, you will find that many of those small ramparts which some of you, and many of yours now passed away, reared with toil and risk to protect you and yours from injustice and insult, have been breached, undermined, and disintegrated. Great, sweeping, reactionary measures are not to be expected, for the conscience of Great Britain still exists, and can still be roused if any great enough issue, any great enough cry is raised. It is against stealthy and individually small, though in the aggregate all-important, assaults that the friends of progress in India have to be on their guard. The enemy will not risk a pitched battle. It is by guerilla warfare, now here, now there, now in this matter, now it that, that they will seek to weaken the position of the governed and strengthen that of themselves, the governing class.

Clearly not only activity, but close union amongst all on our side is essential if we are to repel successfully for the next four or five years these insidious and unremitting attacks. But instead of union, it seems to me that dissensions are rather the fashion now. I am disheartened at the perpetual reports that reach me nowadays of lukewarmness and inertness, aggravated by quarrels and disputes amongst individuals and sections over what are really unimportant issues. I repeat to you that this will not do now. Your position is in many respects an unfavourable and unpropitious one, but unless you can rouse yourselves, unless you can grow once more in earnest, and unless you can once more all march lovingly as true brothers together, shoulder to shoulder, heart true to heart, and hand in hand, that position will during the next few years be most materially changed, and for the worse.

Certainly some of you require to cultivate greater self-reliance and a greater boldness in advancing and advocating and acting up to your own opinions in the face of hostile officials than you appear in some cases, at any rate, to be at present dowered with. The absurd timidity evinced in some cases is heart-breaking—how can such weak vessels be built up into our ramparts? For instance, a gentleman explains the falling off of the circulation of India in one locality by the fact that the police have been going about enquiring for and recording the names of subscribers to this journal. In the first place, it is hardly credible that this can be true; but suppose the police *did* go about recording subscribers' names, how could this possibly signify? Yet dozens of similar incidents are reported to me, showing what we in England should call want of pluck, cases in which people have been frightened (in many cases I believe by terrors they have evolved in their own minds) into abstaining from doing what they had a right to do, or from saying what they had a right to say, and what it was in many cases their duty to say. So, I say, not if you are to advance, but if you are nowadays to hold your own, you must be bold, bold to speak out your minds freely, bold to do what you believe to be right where the laws of your country do not forbid this, bold to expose what you think evil, to praise what you think good, and above all bold, one and all, to assist and support each other in these and similar exercises of your rights as freeborn British subjects.

And I think that you greatly need a modification in your attitude towards a section of the official community. The bureaucratic idea is hateful. Of a considerable section of your bureaucracy, so far as their treatment of the people of India is concerned, nothing good can be said; but there are officials and officials, and there are now many who, even if they do not endorse *all* the demands of the Congress, yet look upon the latter as a most valuable safety-valve and regard with kindly interest the leading aspirations of the party of progress. I think a rational attempt should be made to discriminate between friends, neutrals, and foes, and that every effort should be made to cultivate the good graces of the first two sections (as the second may become the first any day), and to place them in possession of all those multitudinous facts on which our demands for the reforms, set forth at our different Congresses, are based. From the correspondence that reaches me from members of the services, as a rule personally unknown to me, I know as a fact that there are many officials, who believe with us that the wicked extravagance, injustice, jobbery and disregard of individual rights, that now cloud the glory of British rule in India, will never and *can* never be effectively held in check until that rule is popularised, and much more largely shared in by the leaders of the Indian community. I do hope to see hereafter more signs of a friendly feeling between our people and the more enlightened section of the bureaucracy. To me the Tory idea is hateful, the Tory party *anathema maranatha*, but I do not fail to recognise that many Tories are far better than their alleged principles, that there are many excellent men amongst them, and with these I would as gladly work as with the best of my own party. I cannot see why Indian reformers cannot deal similarly with the good section of the bureaucracy. As it is, individuals and the press seem always on the alert to denounce officials without due sense of proportion. A man may for years have been practically on our side; he makes some trifling mistake—or Indian journalists think he does—and then he is denounced in terms that could only be justifiable if applied to one of our regular red-hot, cast-iron, bureaucrats who hate the country and people, and lose no opportunity of misrepresenting the former and vilifying and insulting the latter.

I was much grieved at the attitude taken up in regard to Lord Lansdowne. I had personal dealings with him, and know an honest man when I see him, and I am sure we never had a Viceroy who more sincerely and earnestly desired the good of India's people. He gave the Congress their charter, too, which ought to have been remembered. But because he was, as we think, misled about Chitral and one or two other matters, half the Indian press inveighed against him in terms that would have been hard on Lord Dufferin, a gentleman who, with all his accomplishments and graces, was one of the worst Viceroys India ever had. It is invidious to mention names, but I could give a dozen instances of officials really friendly to our aspirations who had been time after time commended, and rightly so, for impartiality and integrity, but were suddenly attacked and abused vehemently because in some one, occasionally, quite secondary matter, they happened to fail to satisfy Indian editors, or some of them.

Clearly there never was a time at which India's people more needed the co-operation of every friend and well-wisher they can possibly gather round them; and so, an old man, unable to join in the fray myself, as I so gladly did in bygone days, I urge you all to be active, united, bold, and wise—working strenuously and unselfishly for your country's cause; putting aside, in the presence of that holy cause, all personal differences and jealousies, forgetting minor issues, and labouring together as the brothers—sons of one mother—that you are. Be bold, too, to say and do what you feel to be right in the interests of your country and your fellows, regardless who blesses and who bans. *Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum*, is an eternal precept, and, for you, fear nothing except being false to yourselves or your country. Be true to both, and then, though "some may hate" and "some may slight," you may "trust in God and do the right." And, in that "right," remember, is included a fair appreciation of the good work of all who stand in any degree upon our platform—of all who, no matter what their race, or creed, or office, have the good of India's people at heart. Certainly, where your officials are concerned, deal kindly and appreciatively by all whose attitude is in any way friendly towards our people, praising where they act rightly, and only remonstrating courteously, if firmly, where you think they err. The unjust steward was commended for making friends with the mammon of unrighteousness, and still more shall you be commended for labouring to win the good opinions of those struggling to work their way out of that slough of despair; men already with friendly tendencies, and not a few of whom you may secure as real and firm friends.

Turning to their four-armed cross, the old fathers said, "*In hoc signo vinces*." *You* take up *your* cross, whose four arms are, Persistent Activity, Union, Courage, Kindly Wisdom; and believe me when I say *in hoc signo vinces*; on these lines you shall greatly prevail, and not only win unscathed through the dark days of the Tory winter now upon us, but in later and brighter times secure all that is essential to national progress, "all man can ask or heaven can grant."

A. O. Hume.

THE COMING CONGRESS.

By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.

The history of the Indian National Congress cannot but impress every unprejudiced mind with full confidence in its future. There is no demand put forward on behalf of the Congress that is not, so far as I am aware, amply justified by the facts—by the social and political development of the country, by the lack of legislative or administrative activity in correspondence with such development. On the contrary, there are several cases of substantial importance where the claims of the Congress are frankly acknowledged, if not by the Indian Government itself, at any rate by high officials and ex-officials (including ex-Viceroys), although the practical realisation is strangely delayed on grounds that it would be no discourtesy to designate as fanciful and weakly timid. Besides, the tone and temper in which the proceedings of the Congress have been conducted is beyond praise and blame alike. When one considers the variety of elements within the Congress membership, the nature and power of the opposition, open and covert, and the difficult outlook from the commencement of the movement, one would be either much more or much less than human to contemplate the management of the Congress without frank admiration. The aspersions of virulent ignorance and prejudice are no longer permitted to go without prompt contradiction and exposure. Those who know most intimately the guiding spirits of the movement will be least likely to fear that they will allow their heads to be turned by the trying ordeal of an astonishing success.

The little difficulty that arose recently at Poona afforded an unfortunate opportunity to the malevolence of dislike. Probably it was a purely local conflict, springing from temporary misunderstanding or personal pique, and fanned by the sudden heat of the occasion. One would earnestly hope that it has been composed as promptly as it broke out. It is quite inconceivable, on this side of the black water, that any conflict or strain should arise between the Congress on the one hand and the Social Conference on the other. Such a calamity seems impossible, unintelligible, too idiotic for sane men. Both movements are pressing obviously in the same general direction. Both are in complete accordance with the spirit of natural expansion on their several lines. Nowhere need the one come into collision with the other. Everywhere may the one support and advance the other. There seems no sensible reason why a man should not be a member of both, as well as of either. It is incredible that there should be any question which of the two is the greater; that is a question that may be left to the curiosity of the historian. The living point of practical importance would appear to a distant observer to be simply this: how each can do its best, within its own lines, and in sympathy with the other, to advance the common cause of the full expansion of the country, moral and material, in the best light of modern civilisation. But for the ridiculous fuss that has been made in some quarters over the Poona affair, it would have never occurred to one to comment on such an obvious matter of policy, or, rather one should say, on such a natural development of opinion.

Inside the Congress itself, one is gratified to observe that Hindus and Muhammadans work together hand in hand. The same unison is pleasantly marked in the social intercourse of representatives of the two religious bodies, as one observes them in London. No doubt some difficulty is apt to intervene on account of the disproportion of numbers, and occasionally of educational advancement, throughout India. The trouble, where existent, is most likely to arise where the experience of life is narrowest, and fanaticism has the most chance of overbearing reason. It would seem to lie with those whose experience is more mature, and whose reason is more instructed and balanced, to make liberal allowances and large concessions, in the interests of concord. The longer the progressive movement goes forward, the more will the difficulty tend to be reduced. Meantime, the mere counting of heads cannot in all cases be safely relied on for the wise solution of questions that have their roots in religious feeling and social tradition. The outbreaks of violent conflict between Muhammadans and Hindus from time to time have really nothing whatever to do with the Congress, nor are they countenanced by the more enlightened members of either section of the community. They must probably be left to the healing hand of time, with the spread of knowledge and the inculcation of social discipline. Unhappily, however, as things stand, they do too much to prejudice the Congress movement in the eyes of superficial observers in the far West.

Essentially, the work of the Congress must be done in India. At the same time, it would not be easy to overrate the impulse to progress that has been communicated and continuously sustained by the efforts of the British Committee—if it may be permitted to an independent and critical outsider to say for the Committee what it cannot appropriately say for itself. After all, the pulse of government is at Westminster, and the British Committee is in a position to influence its action, both directly and indirectly. It has always appeared to me to be of fundamental importance to inform the British constituencies of the outstanding facts and to conciliate their active interest. It would seem to me to be especially good business for the Congress to enable the British Committee to effect this paramount object in a more continuous and more direct way than, so far as I know, it has yet been able to do. The British interest in India has indeed, in recent years, distinctly increased and deepened. The newspapers, with one or two distinctive examples, have devoted more frequent and better informed attention to Indian questions. Yet there is a marked lack of continuity and courage in their treatment of subjects that touch very nearly the peace and prosperity of the peninsula, and it seems unfortunate that the Congress should not be able to speak to the English electorate directly and frankly on all occasions of real importance. The managers of India will not misunderstand me when I say that their able paper —important and necessary as it is in its own sphere —does not, and essentially cannot, make its appeals generally heard throughout the country. No paper, however ably written, can possibly accomplish the necessary work, except as part of the current treatment of general British questions. Meantime one must have patience with the shortsightedness of English editors, who have not yet recognised, with Sir W. W. Hunter, that the greatest of all British questions in our time is the question of Indian government and administration. It is lamentable to contrast their energetic handling of questions after the mischief is done with their complacent ignoring of the causes as they manifestly work up to the catastrophe.

It is not for me to comment on any part of the programme of the Congress, or to suggest additions, which may best be left to the natural pressure of circumstances. Nor is it necessary to assure the Congress of the deep and sympathetic interest that some of us have learned to take in their proceedings. The great thing is to stand up to the terms of the Charter of India, and to demand respectfully, but firmly and unitedly, its honourable fulfilment in the spirit as well as in the letter. And there is no doubt at all that this is just what the Congress will do, as it has already ten times done. With self-control and patience, the final victory is absolutely assured.

A. F. Murison.

INDIAN CHRISTIANS AND THE CONGRESS.

By A. Nundy.

Secretary to the Gorakhpur Committee.

Just before starting for England I had a conversation with an Indian Christian, holding a prominent position, as to whether it was desirable for Indian Christians to identify themselves with the National Congress movement. To one who has for years past been an adherent of the Congress, there appeared to be but one answer to the question, though I am prepared to admit that in this matter the opinion of the members of this community has been divided, the preponderance, however, being in my favour. My friend, with a certain degree of warmth and energy, advanced three propositions, each of which appeared to me untenable and based on a misapprehension of the real facts, and which I need hardly say I tried my best to controvert. He maintained first, that as a class Indian Christians had held aloof from the Congress; secondly, that their presence was not desired and was not acceptable to the adherents of the Congress; and thirdly, that it is not to the interests of the Indian Christians to throw in their lot with the Congress. These I need hardly say are very serious propositions, and of the utmost consequence both to the Indian Christian community and to the Congress organisation. If it is a fact that Indian Christians have in a body kept aloof from the Congress, that political movement would have the less reason to call itself National, and if there is any foundation for the statement that the presence of the members of that community is not acceptable to the adherents of the Congress it would indeed be a great blot on an institution which professes to embrace all sections of the Indian community. I need scarcely add that to the Indian Christians themselves it is a matter of the utmost consequence to arrive at a correct decision as to whether it is to their interest or not to identify themselves with the Congress movement.

(i) Is it a fact that the Indian Christians as a class are holding aloof from the Congress? In support of the assertion that it is, my friend gave practically two reasons, the one being the numerical weakness of the Indian Christian delegates, and the other the opinion of certain Indian Christians whom he named. I am prepared to admit that the number of Indian Christian delegates who attend the Congress is small, but even if it had been smaller that would not necessarily support the position that the members of our community, as a class, hold aloof from the National gathering every year. For surely in reckoning the number of representatives sent by any community we must take into account their total number, their status in life, their intellectual qualifications, and other considerations, which influence their conduct. The total population of Indian Christians in British India does not exceed 1,500,000, which bears a ratio 1 to 133 as compared with the non-Christian population which may be put down in round numbers as 200,000,000. Taking the figures for five years from 1889 to 1894 the following table will show the number and proportion of Indian Christian delegates at each Congress. I exclude from consideration the year 1892, as during the session of Congress in that year the Decennial Christian Conference was being held at Bombay, and a good many Indian Christians were obliged to absent themselves from the Congress:

Year.	Total Number of Delegates.	Number of Christian Delegates.	Proportion of Christian Delegates.
1889	1,889	36	1 to 52
1890	677	15	1 to 45
1891	812	15	1 to 54
1893	867	10	1 to 86
1894	1,163	10	1 to 116

But we must also take into account certain disabilities under which the Indian Christians labour, and other considerations which influence their conduct. They are as a class very poor, and fill a humble position in life, and as a matter of fact the present census includes some thousands of Christians in Upper India and the Madras Presidency who have been mainly recruited from what may be called the outcasts of Hindu society. Another drawback under which the Indian Christians labour is that a large number of them, at least of the more educated and intelligent amongst them, are in the employ of missionaries, by whom they are guided, and from whom in all important matters they take their cue. I have had a pretty large acquaintance with missionaries and their work, and I can safely say that, with some exceptions, their attitude is not very sympathetic to the Congress. And it is not difficult to account for this. The English missionary is, unfortunately, not exempt from the race prejudice common to all Anglo-Indians, who do not view with favour the political advancement of the subject race. I have also found that, without taking the trouble to inform himself of the real aims and objects of the Congress, he has adopted the views set forth in Anglo-Indian newspapers, or in vogue amonst Anglo-Indian officials. Moreover, it has been my painful experience to find that in some cases the missionaries have adopted the official view in their anxiety to be on good terms with the officials, whose society they court. Thus it has happened that where Indian Christians have shown a desire to take an active part in the Congress movement, they have sometimes been discouraged by the missionaries under whom they have been serving.

That there are some Indian Christians who profess to view with suspicion and distrust the National Congress is an undoubted fact; but I was able to satisfy my friend that in a great many cases there was some ulterior reason underlying and influencing their views. Some are Government servants, and make a virtue of necessity by trying to decry an institution in which they are unable to take a part. One was subordinate to a missionary who held very pronounced views on the subject, and there were two others named by my friend whose opinions had been influenced to a great extent by personal pique and a feeling that they had been slighted by their non-Christian fellow-citizens, and with whom they refused to co-operate in other public matters. I may, therefore, say with confidence that Indian Christians, where they have been able to form an independent and unprejudiced opinion, have shown unanimity in favour of the Congress.

(ii) Is it a fact that the presence and co-operation of Indian Christians is not desired and is not acceptable to the adherents of the Congress? I can claim some acquaintance with the national movement, having for some years past attended its meetings, and as a member of the Subjects Committee obtained an insight into the inner working of this organisation. I feel strongly that it is doing a grave injustice to the members of whom this political movement is composed to imagine that they for a moment cherish any but the most kindly feelings towards their Christian fellow-citizens. In fact, they have displayed a keen anxiety to secure the adherence and co-operation of the Indian Christians, to whom they have shown every attention, and to whose views and prejudices they have evinced a disposition to subordinate their own opinions. Naturally every delegate looks forward with some eagerness to being placed on the committee, and the Indian Christian delegates, being numerically weak, would, without the aid of their non-Christian brethren, have no chance whatever of serving on the committee. Yet we find every year five to six members of my community elected by the non-Christians, who by so doing displace so many of their own co-religionists. On several occasions, to my knowledge, the non-Christian delegates have subordinated their views to those of the Christians. One notable instance occurred in Calcutta when, the Subjects Committee sitting late on a Saturday night and not having finished its work, it was proposed to adjourn till Sunday; but on an objection being raised by Mr. K. C. Bannerjee, it was unanimously agreed that the next formal meeting of the committee would be held on the following Monday, though any members who so pleased might meet informally on the Sunday. And the Indian Christians who have attended the Congress will bear me out that they have been treated with every consideration and courtesy, whilst the opinions expressed by Mr. K. C. Bannerjee and the late Rev. Ram Chunder Bose have always carried due weight, and the addresses delivered by them have been received with enthusiasm.

(iii) Is it to the interest of the Indian Christians or not to throw in their lot with the Congress movement? This is a question to which I have given very serious consideration, and I do both deny that it is to their interest to keep aloof from the Congress, and that, if it were to their interest to do so, it would in the long run be wise or politic to further their own present purposes by doing what, as a matter of principle, would be wrong. It has been said, Look at the Muhammadans; they have kept aloof from the Congress because they saw by so doing they were promoting their own interests so far as the British Government was concerned, which, in furtherance of its policy to "divide and rule," practically encouraged them to take this step. Even if this were true, there are two matters which claim our consideration: First, Is the step we are taking right in itself? and secondly, Will it in the long run further our own interests? I think every intelligent and educated Indian who has given the subject any consideration will concede that the aim and objects of this political movement are good in themselves, and that it has already achieved some success, and has the prospect of achieving a great deal more. Assuming for a moment that the Indian Christians would further their own interests by standing aloof from it, is it right, or proper, or patriotic to do so? Which is preferable—for the Indian Christians to advance slowly and gradually (it may be) with their non-Christian brethren, or to sacrifice them for securing some temporary advantage? Surely no arguments are required to show which is the proper course to adopt. If we have any sense of patriotism, or of kindly feeling towards our fellow-citizens, we ought not to hesitate in coming to a decision on this matter.

But there is another matter to be considered. Supposing we do secure some present advantages by holding aloof will they be productive of good in the long run? I do not think so. A selfish policy on our part is sure to have a demoralising effect. We shall have obtained something, not by reason of any special merit on our own part, but by the favour of a Government which has its own interests to serve by adopting a policy unprincipled and indefensible in itself. What guarantee have we that in no future time the Government will change its present policy; and what will be our position then? Whatever advantages we may have obtained as a mere favour conferred by a superior power will be lost to us when that favour is withdrawn. Already there are indications that there is not the same hostility displayed by the Government towards the Congress as in days past, nor is there, I venture to say, the same attention paid to those who have abstained from identifying themselves with a movement which at the outset had not secured its approval. And I have some grounds for stating that the Muhammadans are now beginning to realise this fact, and to feel that it would have been better for them to have joined the Congress heartily at its initiation. I trust, therefore, that the members of the Indian Christian community will seriously consider this matter, and not allow themselves to be influenced by considerations which their own good sense and good feeling will not approve, but that they will all give their hearty support to a movement which, I believe, is destined to achieve an incalculable amount of good for the people of India.

A. NUNDY.

THE EXTERNAL POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

BY J. DACOSTA.

Nearly one-fifth of the territory comprised within the external frontiers of British India consists of Native States ruled by Indian Princes, our allies, whose rights and obligations towards us were settled by treaties and engagements concluded with them by the late East India Company and confirmed by the British Parliament by section 67 of the Act for the Better Government of India. Our communications with those allies, as well as with the independent Native States lying outside our external frontiers, are conducted through the Secretary of the Indian Government in the Foreign department, and our policy towards both those classes of Native States has long been the subject of public animadversion so far as it aims at the obliteration of the treaty rights of our allies and at the subjugation of our neighbours.

The task of overriding the treaty rights of our Indian allies, and of appropriating their finances on plausible pretexts, has presented no material difficulty as their States are unarmed and isolated, and the rulers are denied the faculty of appealing to Her Majesty's Privy Council or to any judicial tribunal whatever, against wrongs suffered at the hands of the Indian Government. This anomalous condition of things, which is not free from danger, was brought to the notice of Parliament in the significant debate which followed, on July 5th, 1890,[1] a motion for enquiry into "the taking away by the Government of India from the Máháràja of Kashmir the government of his State and a part of his revenue." The motion for enquiry was lost, and encouragement was thus given for the further prosecution of a policy of spoliation which had produced the calamitous events of 1857-58.

It is now attempted to justify the aggressive conduct pursued towards our Indian allies on the ground of alleged constitutional privileges which are claimed for the British Government as the dominant power in India; and theories supporting that claim are published, in which our treaty obligations are ignored, and a distinction is contended for between international law and what the authors of those theories call "Indian political law" which is a code drawn up in the office of the Indian Foreign secretary, and alleged to derive authority from precedents —that is, from unauthorised acts of the Indian Government previously committed.

Beyond those theories, by which it is sought to justify the violation of treaties, nothing has been adduced in defence of the arbitrary conduct pursued towards our Indian allies; and the obvious conclusion from the Government having used its parliamentary majority—which had been obtained on party questions unconnected with India—for the purpose of stifling enquiry in the case of the Máháràja of Kashmir is that no justification exists for the impugned conduct. This conclusion is strongly confirmed by the fact, exposed in the debate, that the Government of India produced forged letters as justifying their encroachment on the treaty rights of the Máháràja, and refused to grant a judicial enquiry into the genuineness of those documents.

Reverting now to the independent native States beyond our external frontier—consisting chiefly of the Muhammadan tribes who inhabit the mountainous region to the north and north-west of India —the policy aiming at their subjugation was initiated on the plea that the occupation of that region by British troops was necessary for the defence of India against the advance of a hostile army through it. The execution of that policy has hitherto proved practically impossible. British troops have repeatedly invaded the tribal territories in question, but had to return without achieving the subjugation of the inhabitants; and the experience gained in our dealings with those tribes during the last half century does not warrant the expectation that our hold of the few isolated spots now occupied by British troops in the borderland will be of a more permanent character than were the positions we took up in the Black Mountain country in 1890, 1891, and 1892, and in other parts in the preceding years. Kabul itself was held by us for months in 1839-42 and in 1879-80. But we were unable to maintain ourselves there, or even to retreat unmolested. On the former occasion the blood of 16,000 British troops and camp followers, who were killed in our retreat, stained the snows of Afghanistan, and a similar disaster was averted in 1880 only by our submitting to terms derogatory to the dignity of a great nation. These lamentable circumstances were sedulously concealed from the public at home. But enough on the subject transpired at the time to cause the immediate downfall of the British Cabinet whose policy had brought about our misfortunes; and, surely, had the papers recording our negotiations with Abdur Rahman in the spring and summer of 1880 not been withheld from Parliament, the revival of that unfortunate policy would not have been sanctioned in 1885 by the representatives of the English people. Now, however, that we are committed to that policy, although it stands condemned by our highest authorities, it becomes important to consider whether results as disastrous as those which it produced before can be averted in the complications into which we are drifting through our overstrained relations with the Amír of Kabul and the tribes of Afghanistan.

---

[1] See *Law Magazine and Review* November, 1893.

The public has been assured by the Government of India that our relations with Abdur Rahman, since the Kabul Conference of 1893, have been of the most friendly character, the differences which necessitated that conference having been amicably settled by the agreement which was then concluded. The text of that agreement has been kept secret, but we are assured that the Amír conceded our claim to bring the Mahsud Wizaris and other border tribes under British influence and control, and that he promised to refrain from aiding those tribes in their hostile opposition to our presence in their territory. We are also assured that the Amír's objection to the fortified railway station built by us at New Chaman, within the limits of his kingdom, has been compromised by the additional subsidy of 600,000 rupees a year, which we have undertaken to pay to His Highness.

It seems perfectly vain, however, and quite irrational to look for friendliness and cordiality in our relations with the Afghans so long as our policy avowedly aims at the conquest and military occupation of their country; and it is likewise a great error to believe that diplomacy and money grants will reconcile the Afghan tribes to the destruction of their ancient independence. When Mr. Schuyler, the American traveller, asked Abdur Rahman, with whom he had an interview in Turkistan in 1873, whether the liberal subsidies which we granted to the Amír Shere Ali had not awakened gratitude in the people of Afghanistan, the reply was: "Were the English to give all the revenues of India, the people would not love them the better for it."

We should bear in mind that the external policy of the Afghans is founded on the Korán, which prohibits the residence in Muhammadan territory of *káfars* or infidels, unless they be guests or servants; and that a solemn vow binds every tribe to co-operate in the expulsion or extermination of *káfar* intruders. It was in obedience to that vow that 30,000 tribesmen gathered in December, 1879, and routed General Roberts' army, compelling it to seek refuge in the intrenchments of Sherpur; and it was the threat of a similar rising, a few months later, that prompted our determination to leave the country forthwith.

These considerations, which derive considerable force from recent events, should convince us of the mistrust and hostility with which the Afghans regard our "forward" policy. In the execution of that policy, since the accession of Abdur Rahman, we attacked the Kabul Khel Waziris, invaded the territories of the Bozdars, the Sheranis, the Chikarzais, the Akazais and the Pariari Syads; we sent expeditions to subjugate the Kakér Khel and the Musa Khel in South Afghanistan; we then resumed hostilities against the Shiranis and Bozdars, and we invaded the country of the Bunérwals. These expeditions, while they failed in their attempts to subjugate the tribes, inflicted on them much suffering by the destruction of their crops and the burning of their villages, and created intense anxiety in their minds for the safety of their country from foreign dominion. In this conjuncture the Amír of Kabul was constrained by the dictates of the Muhammadan religion to address exhortations to the tribes, and the following parts of his addresses deserve our particular attention :—

> "God has imposed *jehâd* on all believers, and whoever shal deny this, shall be a *kâfar*. You should fight the *kâfars* who come into your land. Fear not death. All believers should join in *jehâd*; they should not, like women, sit in their houses, but like men become *ghazis* in the cause of God. True Mussulmans should hasten to the frontiers which it is their duty to guard and protect, preventing *kâfars* from entering the territory of Islam. We call on all inhabitants of cities and villages to support the religion of Islam by prayer, by fasts and by war. The frontiers of the territory of Islam have fallen into the power of oppressors. All believers are bound to join in *jehâd* when they are called to arms. By the grace of God they should do their utmost to uphold the supremacy of the religion of Muhammad. Let them go forth to war and, like tigers, meet the host of unbelievers. Let them mow down with their swords that pernicious body and use their heads as balls."

Letters were written at the same time to the heads of tribes speaking of the English in terms of disparagement, and a proclamation was issued to the great Ghilzai tribe, reminding them that Afghanistan was compassed by two infidel Powers who pretended to be rivals for its possession, but who secretly combined for its conquest. "Were they rivals," the proclamation went on to say, "would they not have attacked each other's country? Oh ye blind men! You are leaving to chance a matter of life and death. After taking our country they will share the spoils, and the heritage of Muhammadans will remain with *kâfars* whose end is evil. They will not be satisfied with taking the country of the Afghans. They will introduce in it their customs which are disgraceful in the extreme."

These appeals greatly excited the tribes in their hostility against us, and although we added to the numerical strength of our subsequent transfrontier expeditions, our troops returned without establishing British rule in the territories invaded by them, namely, Waziristan and the Black Mountain and Miranzai countries. We then remonstrated with Abdur Ráhman regarding these inflammatory addresses, and, receiving no satisfaction on the subject, we threatened him with annihilation in the following terms:—

> "The evasion of the Amír might compel the British Government to modify the benevolent and friendly attitude it is desirous of maintaining towards the Amír and his kingdom. The Government will not be lightly turned from its settled policy; it possesses the means of bringing considerable pressure to bear upon its ally in a disciplinary way. The Government can do without the strong and independent Afghanistan it strives to maintain. But whenever it shall cease to struggle for that end, Afghanistan as a kingdom shall disappear."—(*Times*, Nov. 2, 1892.)

Our threat remained as ineffectual as our remonstrance had been, and a third Afghan war seemed inevitable, when diplomacy obtained the Amír's consent to a conference being held in his capital for the adjustment of our differences. The agreement concluded at that conference in November, 1893, was ostentatiously proclaimed by us as having removed every cause of complaint on either side, and restored confidence and cordiality in our relations with the ruler of Afghanistan. But subsequent events have exposed the hollowness of the expectations raised on that occasion. For instance, when Umra Khan, who defied us at Chitral, went to Kabul after his defeat,

> "It was anticipated that he would meet with short shrift; but the Amír, instead of hanging the chief of Jandoul, *fêted* him, and, according to the latest report, married the daughter of Umra Khan to the heir apparent. Abdur Rahman has, moreover, taken to subsidising a *Mullah* who made himself conspicuous by preaching *jehâd* while the late Chitral campaign (one main object of which was to smash Umra Khan) was going on."—(*Pioneer*, Oct. 16, 1895.)

The Amír is also known to resent the attitude of suzerain over Afghanistan which we have been assuming before the world. He likewise resents our unfounded statement that we placed him on the throne of Kabul. He now understands that the Viceroy of India, through whom our communications with him are carried on, is only an official serving under other officials in England, who, in turn, have to obey the majority of the House of Commons. He claims, therefore, as an independent sovereign, to hold direct communications with the British Government. Accordingly, when he accepted for his son Nasarulla our Queen's invitation to visit England, he instructed that son to lay before Her Majesty his request that an Afghan embassy be received in London. The denial of that request cannot fail to intensify the bitterness of his feelings towards us.

In conclusion, the main results of our Afghan policy since 1876—known as the "forward" frontier policy—have been the disastrous war of 1878-80, and the series of equally unsuccessful trans-frontier expeditions, which have added more than fifty millions sterling to the public debt of India, reduced the Indian Exchequer to insolvency, and engendered hatred and mistrust in our tribal neighbours, without securing the smallest countervailing advantage for all the blood and treasure expended in our attempts to extend British influence and control over our tribal neighbours.

Mr. Balfour, speaking at Glasgow on Nov. 14th, said that the tribes dwelling between Peshawar and Chitral had been so impressed by their contact with the British army and their knowledge of British civilisation, that they were sending petition after petition for the incorporation of their territory in the British Empire. Mr. Curzon had already told us that the attitude of the tribes in Southern Afghanistan had become more friendly towards England than towards Afghanistan itself. The recent war in Waziristan has since then shown how completely Mr. Curzon had been misled by those from whom he derived his information. But that an experienced and distinguished statesman should be deceived on the value of professions of love made by Muhammadan tribesmen known to be fanatically hostile to us as infidels, and to our policy as a menace to their ancient independence, seems, indeed, a deplorable circumstance in the present critical state of our relations with the Afghans.

The retention of the Chitral territory, of the Malakand Pass, and of Chakdara, violates the assurances conveyed to the tribes by our proclamation of March last, and is consistent only with our avowed "forward" frontier policy, which requires the military occupation of the territories dividing India and the Russian outposts. The plea adduced for that policy has been the defence of India against a Russian attack. Mr. Balfour, however, defends the retention of Chitral and the other territories upon a different ground; he says:

> "When we came into power, we determined that where the British soldier had been there we would remain—(loud cheers)—and that it was not our business to retreat. You ask what are our arguments for the retention of Chitral? Beyond military and strategical arguments, there are moral arguments which every man acquainted with the East knows to be overwhelming. We hold our Empire because we are looked upon as a strong Power which does not retreat; as a Power which loves justice, but which means to be master." (Cheers.)

These sentences evidently stirred a martial spirit in those to whom they were addressed. But many of them must have remembered that the British soldier had twice been to Kabul, to Ghazni and to Kandahar, and that we did not remain in those cities for the possession of which our soldiers had fought and displayed courage and much power of endurance. Mr. Balfour's words, however must be taken, not as a statement of fact relating to the past, but as the expression of an ardent desire connected with the present. But how, when the British soldier, in obedience to a mistaken policy, is led into a situation where disaster and humiliation, not glory or prestige, would be our lot, if we remained in it? To that situation Mr. Balfour's theory—that "it is not our business to retreat"—seems inapplicable. And yet such was precisely our situation at Kabul in 1840 and 1880, and Mr. Balfour does not attempt to show that such may not be our situation at Chitral, where we have remained in opposition to the opinion of very high authorities among our military officers and statesmen.

J. DACOSTA.

LORD LANSDOWNE ON CHITRAL.

The winter season of the Imperial Institute was opened on November 4th with an illustrated lecture on Chitral, delivered by Captain F. E. Younghusband, C.I.E., late political officer at Chitral. The Marquis of Lansdowne, Secretary of State for War, presided, and at the conclusion of the lecture said:—

I am quite sure that you will allow me in your name to thank Captain Younghusband for the admirable lecture to which we have just listened. I think we all of us followed the events which he described as they were from time to time chronicled in the London Press; but in order to understand them correctly it was necessary that they should be brought together, and that the three great acts in this most interesting drama should be explained as he has explained them to us this evening. I think the impression which will remain upon most of our minds is this—that had it not been for the fact that all those concerned not only did their duty, but perhaps even a little more than their duty, what we are now contemplating as a brilliant and successful exploit of arms might have been converted into an overwhelming and humiliating disaster. I think in the first place we must give due credit to Lord Elgin's Government for the courage and promptitude with which they determined to move a large force of troops across the frontier to the relief of the little beleaguered force in Chitral. A few days' hesitation or irresolution, the adoption of half measures, would inevitably have brought with them failure and discredit. Then I think we shall agree with the lecturer in what he told us of the extraordinary success and rapidity with which the mobilisation of General Lowe's force was effected. I think I am right in saying that on the 12th day after the orders for the mobilisation had been given the force crossed the frontier. That is, I venture to say, most creditable to the distinguished officer who is now commander-in-chief in India, Sir George White, and that admirable soldier and member of the Viceroy's Council, Sir Henry Brackenbury, and also let me add to their predecessors, Lord Roberts and a very old friend and colleague of mine, now, alas! no longer with us, Sir George Chesney. With their names I must associate the name of Sir Edwin Collen, Secretary to the Government of India in the Military Department, one of the most painstaking and able public servants that I ever had the good fortune to come in contact with. As to the part played in these events by the different actors in them, I think we shall say that what appeals perhaps most of all to us naturally is the gallantry of the besieged, because after all, those who were advancing to their relief were every day finding themselves one step nearer to the realization of their object, whereas those who were in the Chitral fort were surrounded by the most depressing circumstances, and for aught they knew must have believed that every day brought them nearer to a great and disastrous catastrophe. I can only find one epithet which characterizes their conduct—I think it was Homeric. The subject was one about which an epic poem could be written. I do not know that there was among that band of heroes any one with a turn for poetry. The only trace of poetry I have been able to discover in the lecture to which we have just listened was that stirring incident in which the little force improvised a Union Jack out of the shreds and tatters of uniforms, and hoisted it over the fort and felt that from that day the tide of fortune had turned in their favour. It is a very remarkable thing that the successful defence of Chitral and the advance of Colonel Kelly's force were both accomplished without that stiffening of European troops so dear to the heart of a commanding officer. Are we not justified in saying in regard to the garrison of Chitral that that stiffening was supplied by that splendid band of the 14th Sikhs, whose picture was exhibited just now on the sheet? Some of those whom I am addressing have been in India, and I think they will agree with me that there is no specimen of a man and a soldier that impresses one more favourably than a Sikh veteran, such as that old Sikh officer whose picture was the central figure in the group at which you were looking just now. Let me say one word in commendation of the conduct of the Kashmir troops. They were to some extent untried; but I think it is most creditable to the military spirit of the Kashmir forces, over which his Highness the Máhárája of Kashmir, ably seconded by his brother, the commander-in-chief of the Kashmir army, presides. I cannot speak too highly of the interest which they have taken and the efforts which they have made to convert their badly disciplined, badly armed, and badly equipped troops into a force worthy of taking a place alongside of our troops in the defence of the empire. But the real stiffening was supplied by the little band of British officers who were in command of the force, and let me say this—that anyone who has served as I have for any length of time in India must come away deeply impressed with the enormous power exercised by the personal influence of our fellow-countrymen in that country. Whether you take a military officer, or whether you take a young civilian to whose capacity the welfare, perhaps, of half a million of natives may be committed, you find that our representatives by their character and conduct exercise a personal influence over the native populations of that country which is most creditable to them. We hold India not by the quantity of our representatives, but by their quality, and a more splendid example of that quality could not, I think, be found than that which was found in the defence of the Chitral fort. One word more; on these occasions we eschew controversial matters, and we shall not attempt to decide whether Lord Elgin's Government was justified in the advice which it gave respecting the future of Chitral, or whether Her Majesty's Government was justified in the action it took on that advice; but whatever our opinions on that point may be we shall one and all of us rejoice that up to the present time the relations between our troops and our officials and the tribesmen have been of the most satisfactory and reassuring character. The fact is that, much as the tribesmen may detest us when our presence amongst them makes itself felt by punitive expeditions, by fines, and by blockades, when our troops, and especially our military officers, are brought into contact with them, when they find that we treat them justly and fairly, that we do not wish to interfere with their private customs or to press upon them our courts and our codes, they are perfectly ready to become our friends, and the latest advices which we receive from that part of the frontier go to show that those are the relations which are rapidly growing up between the wild tribes and the British troops. We cannot have failed to be struck by the extraordinary courage, and, I may say, the extraordinary resources, exhibited by these tribesmen during the progress of these hostilities. Is it too much to hope that we may find at that part of the frontier a new recruiting ground, where we may find, whether in the shape of levies or of regular troops, very valuable members of the military forces of the crown of India? I feel sure that the men who have exhibited so much courage and so much resource in the siege of Chitral fort only require to be led by officers such as those who commanded the beleaguered garrison fortress to be invincible in warfare, and I trust that we may see in time that they will take part with us, and form a new source from which excellent native troops may be attracted to our service. (Loud cheers.)

WHAT THE "FORWARD" POLICY MEANS.

"NEW DANGERS AND FRESH WRONGS."

The current number of the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* contains an important article by Mr. G. W. Leitner, LL.D., which, under the title "New Dangers and Fresh Wrongs," discusses (i) the Chitral Blue-book and Kafiristan, and (ii) the suppressed Treaties and the ignored Proclamation.

THE ENSLAVEMENT OF KAFIRISTAN.

Commenting on the Chitral Blue-book, Dr. Leitner says that "the documents that, at once, strike one by their absence, to use perhaps an Irishism, are the very ones which form the alleged *raison d'être* of the Chitral expedition and of the Blue-book itself. These are the referred to, but not published, Treaties, by one of which the late Aman-ul-Mulk of Chitral is supposed to have acknowledged the suzerainty of Kashmir, and the second, 'the Durand Treaty' which, it is coolly stated on page 44 of the Chitral Blue-book to an Anti-Slavery nation, has handed over 'to Afghanistan the whole of the Kafir country up to Chitral.'"

"Let England and the educated world ring with the news that 'the brethren of the European,' the remnants of a pre-historic culture—and that, too, the prototype of our own—the tribes that for a thousand years have so bravely resisted Muhammadan slave-raids, our dear and loyal friends since the days of Sale at Jelalabad till the recent 'demarcation of the Afghan boundary under the Durand Treaty' alienated its Bashgali Section, have been handed over by Christain, missionary, and 'righteous' England to inevitable extermination by the surrounding Afghans or Pathans. I have no doubt that the ever-vigilant British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, which more than twenty years ago protested against these kidnapping expeditions and entrusted Jamshed, the brave nephew of the famous General Feramorz, a Siah Posh Kafir, then in England, with a message of comfort to his race and of trust in the protection of the British Government and people, will not allow, without a word of protest, any such transference of human beings and liberties as is indicated in the Durand Treaty. Parliament should certainly insist on its being published at once, lest it hide some other evil, to be sprung at some future time upon the unsuspecting British public, just as the iniquity to which I have referred has now been."

A Policy of Stultification.

The first result of the Durand Treaty will, Dr. Leitner says, be the stultification of its own avowed policy of keeping Afghan influence out of Chitral, by substituting for it the actual presence of Afghan troops along the Kafir mountains that skirt Chitral.

"This is inevitable as the breachloaders, with which we have so plentifully supplied the Amir, will soon make short work of the heroic Kafirs, mostly armed with knives and bows. Now I am in favour of the extension of so much of the Amir's *influence* as is necessary to establish the same friendly policy which he represents towards England throughout the whole of the region that intervenes between the Russian and British boundaries in Asia. More than this influence will not be tolerated in Chitral or by the Dard races generally, among which—at any rate, for purposes of distinction from Pathans as well as for other reasons—the Kafirs may be included."

"Rape, Plunder and Death."

If there is one lesson more than any other that we might learn from recent Chitral history, it is, at last to cease from interference with the independence of States.

"It will be a revelation to Radical-Liberals to find that their Ministry has so trampled on their avowed principles as to give up an entire inoffensive and friendly people to rape, plunder and death. Probably, it will be a revelation to the Ministry itself and it may induce future aspirants to the rule of Oriental races first to learn something about them and their languages. As for Lord Salisbury, he spoke with no uncertain voice in reply to an Appeal on behalf of the Kafirs which was made to him in 1874 by the Anti-Slavery Society."

Wanted: "Elementary Knowledge."

This Memorial Dr. Leitner reproduces, and he is justly indignant "that a self-governing nation should have been involved in a course of action, without its knowledge or consent, in spite of Parliament and of the press and in defiance of its avowed principles and cherished traditions."

"Were the rulers of India who, from the safe and distant watch-tower of England, take a lofty bird's-eye view of our great dependency, to really study what they govern, we should not have seen their self-exposure in Parliament in the recent Chitral debate, in which the late Secretary of State, with the best intentions no doubt, credited Nizam-ul-Mulk with innumerable murders, mistaking him throughout for *our* nominee Afzul-ul-Mulk, the wholesale fratricide, and probable parricide of Aman-ul-Mulk. One financial authority also confounded *crores* with *lakhs*, and another misapplied the superficial remarks of Dr. Robertson regarding the fickleness of Chitralis to the Pathan, who is unchangeably hostile to British rule. This fickleness, moreover, was accepted as the crucial test in connexion with the question of keeping up or abandoning the Peshawar-Chitral road. Now this road, *viâ* Bajaur, has existed for traffic from times immemorial, and was good enough to enable our troops to get to Chitral within a month and will be good enough, without any further expenditure, to enable us to do so again at any time. At all events, neither the fickleness of the tribes nor their hostility need involve us in a relatively greater outlay on keeping the road open than is now so well spent on the equally 'fickle' Khaiber Pass Afridis."

The Alleged Suzerainty of Kashmir.

Passing on to "the supposed treaties and the ignored Proclamation" Dr. Leitner points out that he has stated over and over again that:—

"Chitral, Yazin, Hunza, Nagyr, and other similar poverty-stricken principalities acknowledge *any* power within their possible reach as their protector, or rather milch-cow, provided they can get something in the shape of blackmail or subsidy in return for professions of humility and friendship and for such presents as a bag or two of apricots, a handful of gold-dust (as in the case of Hunza), or a couple of goats. During, and after, the very time that Aman-ul-Mulk is supposed to have acknowledged the suzerainty of Kashmir, I had messengers of his staying in the compound of my house at Lahore, and if this alleged treaty had been more than a *façon de parler*, I should certainly have known of it. What I, however, did know was, that whenever Aman-ul-Mulk wanted to get money out of the Indian Government by the conventional repetition of expressions of goodwill, such as are used in the East from every inferior to a superior chief, he was steadily snubbed."

"K.C.B. Mania."

Dr. Leitner has some important observations upon the origin of these complications beyond the North-West frontier:—

"I have no hesitation in stating that one and all of the complications with Chilás, Hunza-Nagyr, the Pamirs and Chitral have solely arisen from the personal ambition of our officials under the influence of the K.C.S.I. or 'K.C.B. mania,' as called by a late Commander-in-Chief. I assert from my own knowledge, that not only in 1866, but also as late as 1886, the very name of Russia was unknown in Dardistan. Russia abstained, especially after the Granville-Gortchakoff treaty of 1872-73, from all expeditions within a hundred miles of the Pamirs and the alleged visit of Grombtcheffsky to Hunza proper (which I deny) was a very slight tit-for-tat to the never-ceasing restlessness of our authorised and unauthorised agents. The Hunza raids had stopped in 1867; those of Chilás in 1855; yet all these raids were re-invented in 1891-93 to justify, in public opinion, our occupation, at a ruinous expense, of countries that formed bulwarks to our Empire, so long as we did not break them down. In 1872 I was already pointing out at the Anthropological and other Societies that Kashmir and Afghanistan were approaching their respective froniters to the detriment of the intervening tribes,' and I anticipated 'the day on which the last Kafir girl would be sold to an Afghan by her father in order to escape a worse fate for himself and her,' but I never foresaw that this crime against humanity would be perpetrated with the treaty aid of England, and so shortly after the visit of Dr. Robertson to Kafiristan, where he was received with hospitality."

A Policy of "Wanton Encroachments."

The alliance of France with Russia will now, Dr. Leitner thinks, bear fruit in continued alarms along our Indian frontier, probably entailing new expeditions (there is the "Asmar Key" still left) and draining Indian revenues, till the Indian population is driven to despair or rebellion under the burden of ever-increasing taxation wasted apparently in order that the mischief-makers be knighted.

"The Indian chiefs, or such of them as the new school of politicals may leave with any power, will, no doubt, fight for us to the last, but it is imprudent to leave them with grievances which Russia promises to redress. As for the Indian peoples, our interference with caste and their anglicisation have sapped the foundations of their social fabric and of our rule. They are also learning discontent in our schools, whilst we are adding seditious elements in the new acquisitions. After all, India cannot be kept on the present scale of pay and also enjoy frontier wars, and a smaller rate of remuneration will not be worth the while of 'the commercial instincts of an imperial race.' There is, therefore, no need for an invasion of India if the present policy of wanton encroachments is continued, for the country is ripening, or rather rotting, for any power that will have it and undertake to govern it at half the present amount of salaries, which would then still be largely in excess of the remuneration given to French and Russian functionaries, not to speak of the *employés* of Native States."

CONDEMNED BY EXPERTS.

Finally, we may remark, with Dr. Leitner, the significance of the fact that none of the advocates of a "forward" policy have anything like the same intimate knowledge of the frontiers now concerned that is possessed by Sir Donald Stewart, Sir Neville Chamberlain, Sir James Lyall, Sir Lepel Griffin, Lord Chelmsford and others, whilst Lord Roberts, who is the sole real expert on the other side, himself advocated the withdrawal from every part of the frontier that he personally knows, and only recommends advance in those parts that he does not know. "Just as the Russian victory at Penjdeh brought about a closer Anglo-Afghan Alliance, so will the occupation of Chitral eventually lead to a combination of the tribes against us under Russian auspices."

DINNER TO MR. BHOWNAGGREE.

A complimentary banquet was given on November 13th, at the Whitehall Rooms, Hôtel Métropole, to Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree, M.P., C.I.E., on the occasion of his election as member of Parliament for North-East Bethnal-green. Lord Harris, K.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., presided, and among those present were the Earl of Jersey, Sir Stewart Bayley, Sir F. Abel, Sir Lepel Griffin, Sir Edwin Arnold, Sir Roper Lethbridge, Mr. Gorell Barnes, M.P., Sir W. W. Hunter, Sir G. S. Fitzgerald, Mr. Lee Warner, Sir H. S. King, Mr. A. P. Sinnett, Sir R. West, Dr. Leitner, Dr. T. Cooke, Sir A. Wilson, Sir George Birdwood, Sir J. B. Lyall, Sir Juland Danvers, Sir Theodore Hope, Mr. H. Thornton, Mr. Austen Low, Mr. M. Ghose, Mr. G. J. Moolah, Mr. D. R. Calah, and Dr. Whittington Lowe. We take the following report from the *Times*. References to the subject will be found in "Indiana."

The CHAIRMAN proposed the toasts of "The Queen, Empress of India," and "The Prince of Wales and the Rest of the Royal Family," which were loyally honoured, after which,

Sir W. W. HUNTER gave that of "The Guest of the Evening." He said that it was with extreme diffidence that he did so, for he saw around him many distinguished men who would have brought to the duty an eloquence which he did not possess. But no one even in that distinguished company could speak of their friend with a more thorough appreciation of the services which he had rendered to India in the past, or with a more assured hope that he was destined to render still higher services to India in the future. The task before Mr. Bhownaggree was not an easy one, for they welcomed him that evening not only, and indeed not chiefly, as a member of the great Unionist party at home, but also as the representative of that spirit of conservative progress which animated the vast majority of the princes and peoples of India. He stood before the British Empire as the one man of Indian birth in the great council of the realm. (Cheers.) He had duties not alone to his constituents and his party in England, but also to nations and races on the other side of the globe, who would look to him to protect their interests and to make known their needs. It was a difficult combination of duties. But he had the comforting assurance that all right-minded Englishmen regarded India as the client, not of one political party or another, but of the whole British people. (Cheers.) From this Imperial point of view they must all regret the absence of a well-known figure from the present Parliament. He for one could never mention the name of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji without sentiments of respect, for he could never forget that he was the first man who proved, after a long and hard struggle, that the House of Commons is open *de facto* as well as *de jure* to our Indian fellow-subjects. He had disappeared from the scene for the moment. But, however widely some of them might differ from him in politics, they must all hope to see him at some future day again in the position which he so gallantly won. (Cheers.) What India required most of all at this moment was a mediator. She had entered on a new industrial era in which a conflict of mercantile interests might at any time arise between her manufacturing classes and the corresponding classes at home. If such a conflict should ever arise it seemed to him that their friend Mr. Bhownaggree was peculiarly fitted to act as an arbitrator in that difficult matter. But the conflicting currents amid which he had to steer his way were not merely confined to the commercial interests between India and Great Britain. They involved the conflict of interests in India itself. We had now, in fact, three Indias on our hands. There was the old India, with its vast masses still almost untouched by Western influences. There was the India of the feudatory princes, with their awakening needs, their free-will offerings of troops to the Suzerain power, and their great and vigorous loyalty to the throne. There was also the new India, the India of Western education, of Western aims and modes of thought, the India of British liberty of speech. The more advanced classes in this new India had organised themselves into an association which no Indian statesman and no Indian member of Parliament could overlook—he meant the Indian National Congress. Whatever they might think of the details of the programme of that Congress, it represented a political power in India which no Indian statesman and no Indian member of Parliament could afford to disregard. The Indian Congress was essentially the child of British rule, the product of our schools and Universities. We had created and fostered the aspirations which animated the Congress, and it would be both churlish and unwise to refuse now to those aspirations both our sympathy and our respectful consideration. He believed they would agree with him that Mr. Bhownnaggree was peculiarly suited by his education and past life to deal with that threefold India which he had just described. (Cheers.) By his early training Mr. Bhownaggree was the child of new India. He was first a student of Elphinstone College, at Bombay; then a journalist, and by turns the promoter of the Bombay gymnasium, the advocate of female education, and the secretary to the famous Rukmabhai Committee, which, by a long, determined legal contest, upheld the rights and dignity of Indian womanhood. He afterwards became an English barrister. A man of the new India, he was also a man of feudatory India, as the adviser of an important native State, and the reorganiser of its judicial administration on the British system. But he had never lost touch with the old India, the India of the masses, the India still apart from Western modes of thought. He began life as a Conservative, and one of his earliest triumphs was winning the Elphinstone College prize by an essay on "The Constitution of the East India Company." This little treatise he afterwards developed into a larger work of a strongly Conservative tendency. He now sat as the first Indian Conservative member of the House of Commons. From first to last his view of Indian reform had been reform on a Constitutional basis, and his idea of Indian progress had been progress on Conservative lines. It had been the lot of most of them there present to wish God-speed to a son, or a brother, or some dear friend on his starting for the distant lands of the East.

They all knew the pathos of such a moment. Their friend Mr. Bhownaggree was now embarking on untried seas. They did not underrate the difficulties and dangers of the voyage. But they had a firm confidence that, starting as he did amid the friendly wishes of thousands in this country and of millions in his own, and bearing forth the good seed of his past services to India, he would assuredly come again rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him. (Loud cheers.)

The toast was enthusiastically drunk.

Mr. **Bhownaggree**, in responding, expressed his deep sense of the honour which had been done him in inviting him to that banquet, and his gratitude to the electors of North-east Bethnal Green for the confidence which they had placed in him in returning him as member of Parliament for that division. After describing in eloquent terms the work done in the interests of India by the British race, he asked how, in view of this work, and while seeing from day to day and from week to week the condition of the oriental States from Egypt and Turkey to utmost China, he could forbear throwing in his lot with that party and that policy which gave the best promise of securing the union of India with Great Britain and the best practical results of that union. (Cheers.) There were those in India who tried to sow discontent with British rule. The new orator and journalist would have none of such men as himself, but he thought he and we could survive their wrath. (Laughter and cheers.) There were after all behind the loudly-coloured drop-scene painted by these agitators the powerful Raja and contented Sepoy to march in Imperial alliance with the British soldier against the frontier foe; there were the landholder, the shroff, the merchant, and the trader, who realised what it was to enjoy their holdings, to possess their silver, and to pursue their commerce in peace; there were the poor labourer and the rayat, who knew there was the mabap spirit in the land which intervened between them and the former tyranny of forced labour and plundered crops; and there was even the wise moderation and sobriety of the maturer years of the scholar and the journalist overtaking the exuberant sentimentality of youth. To all these at least such patriotism and sympathy as he was capable of would not appeal in vain. They were good enough company for him, and if we did not fail them, if we with all our influence and the authority of our pronouncement and he in his humble way could co-operate with the Government of the day in their endeavour to deal justly by them, or could set the popular mind right when it was perplexed by unfair class advocacy on important questions vital to their well-being and just treatment, such as, say, the repeal of the cotton duties, the abolition of opium, or the indignity sought to be inflicted upon them in regions which were under British influence, like South Africa; if we did such real service to them we might depend upon it they would not fail us. (Loud cheers.)

Sir **Roper Lethbridge** proposed the health of the chairman.

Lord Harris, in acknowledging the toast, said that various letters of regret at inability to be present had been received, among them the following from Lord George Hamilton: "In expressing my regret at not being able to be present at the dinner of congratulation to Mr. Bhownaggree on his election to Parliament, I desire to add a few words of cordial personal congratulation to your guest. He has for years past resided in the constituency I represent, and has there established a high character for benevolence and public spirit. His public career in his own country has been most creditable and successful. I rejoice to think that he comes to the Imperial Parliament as a Unionist and Imperialist, and I feel confident that his advocacy of the views of his fellow-countrymen will be the more successful in the House of Commons, inasmuch as he does not associate himself with those who wish to destroy and revolutionise the organic institutions of this country."

The **Earl of Jersey** proposed "The Indian Services," the toast being acknowledged by Sir **Theodore Hope**, and the health of "The Visitors," proposed by Sir **Lepel Griffin**, and responded to by Mr. **F. Gorell Barnes**, M.P., followed.

Lord Harris, speaking in East London on November 11th, said that "a cricket match in India was the greatest compliment that could be paid to British rule in that country." This, as the *Westminster Gazette* said, seems a little "steep."

BRITISH OPINIONS ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

INDIAN MILITARY EXPENDITURE.

The rock that lies ahead of us in India is pointed out clearly and forcibly by Sir Auckland Colvin in the new number of the *Nineteenth Century*. Indian expenditure is rising steadily and fast, and India's ability to pay is not rising in proportion. During the ten years from 1884-5 to 1893-4 the net increase in the expenditure was Rx. 11,359,135 To the extent of about Rx. 3,200,000 this increase has been defrayed by means of cotton duties. Other taxation has increased by about Rx. 3,000,000. The increase in the State land revenue through the periodical revisions of rent has amounted to about Rx. 4,200,000, while Rx. 1,000,000 has been appropriated from the protective Famine Grant for the payment of ordinary expenses. This gives a total increase of revenue by Rx, 11,400,000. Out of Rx. 6,200,000, as much as Rx. 4,500,000 has been obtained by taxes which have been, as Sir Auckland Colvin says, "deliberately condemned by successive administrations both in India and England." The salt tax tends to limit the consumption of an article necessary to health, while the cotton duties offend against accepted principles of finance, raise the cost of necessary articles for the inhabitants of India, and tend to depress and disturb a great English industry. The appropriations from the Famine Grant lessen the security against popular suffering and discontent. Now for the causes of the increased expenditure. They are, first, increased military charges; secondly, the unfavourable course of exchange; and, thirdly, increased activity in the making of State railways on a "gold basis." The last of these causes is, in Sir Auckland Colvin's opinion, certain to continue to operate, the late and the present Secretaries for India having pointed towards a liberal revival of railway guarantees. No substantial relief from the loss on exchange is to be hoped for. There may be a slight and momentary rally, but the exchange would have to rise to 1s. 5d. before other sources of revenue could be relieved to the extent of Rx. 6,500,000. There remains the third source of increased expenditure—increased military charges. Is there any sign of relief from these? On the contrary, the military party is already looking forward to the sequels of the Chitral campaign. "It is not unlikely," writes one who is saturated with this spirit, "that it may prove necessary to subdue the turbulent tribes of Yaghistan before we can fully establish peace on our own border." And again, "It is quite possible that Kafirstan and not Chitral may eventually be found to be the key of the position. . . . . Now that the point of greatest strategic importance has been shifted from Gilghit to Chitral, it is manifestly of vital importance that we should know what sort of a country it is, and whether there are any easy passes into or out of it." So that on the side of expenditure the three points of the prospect are more payments for railways, more payments for wars, and undiminished payments to make up the loss on exchange. On the side of revenue the correlatives of these three points are, first, increased taxes on salt or other necessary articles of food; secondly, increased inroads on the insurance fund against famine; thirdly, maintained and perhaps increased and extended import duties on products of English manufacture. The English public must get the fact well into its head that every Chitral we seize means a new risk of starvation and revolt in British India as well as a new lease of life to Indian duties on Lancashire goods. It must understand that Indian policy is now controlled by soldiers and politicians who fully intend that the Chitral episode shall not be the last of its kind, and it must understand that this policy is not the unanimously chosen policy of experts in Indian government but a policy always condemned by many of the most experienced Indian soldiers and statesmen. Equally in defence of their own interests, in mercy for the poorest inhabitants of India and in regard for the stability of our government in that country, Englishmen and especially Lancashire men are bound in prudence and duty to weigh this evidence and make their judgment on it felt.—*Manchester Guardian*, October 31.

MR. BALFOUR ON CHITRAL.

Weak and poor as is Mr. Balfour's attack upon the late Prime Minister, his defence of the annexation of Chitral is weaker and poorer still. It would be interesting to know what great soldiers, like Lord Wolseley and Sir Redvers Buller, think of this rash and reckless apology for a piece of military folly which, if it be really committed, will have few parallels in the annals of our Indian Empire. Every-one will agree with Mr. Balfour's just tribute to the skill and gallantry by which Sir George Robertson was rescued from Chitral. But it is sophistry of the worst kind to mix up respect for Sir Robert Low, his officers, and men, with approval of a subsequent decision for which the present Ministers of the Crown are solely responsible. They reversed the deliberate and unanimous judgment of their predecessors in the teeth of the highest professional opinion which the civil advisers of the Crown could obtain. But there is a much more serious matter involved than even the irreparable, or almost irreparable blunder, of opening to an invader a road previously closed. Mr. Balfour had the assurance to talk of "British honour." If the honour of the country can be pledged by the representative of the Queen, it is a distinct breach of faith to annex Chitral after the proclamation of the Viceroy. But here we wish to enter a protest against assuming that the First Lord of the Treasury is correct in his assertions. We are by no means sure that the Government have determined to annex Chitral, or that Chitral will be annexed. Mr. Balfour is not distinguished for accuracy, and a perusal of the very meagre Blue-book issued from the India Office only proves that the Cabinet of Lord Salisbury had determined to disagree with the Cabinet of Lord Rosebery. The doubt suggested by the Blue Book is increased by Mr. Balfour's speech last night. He told his audience that the annexation of Chitral would not add a single soldier to the British army. According to the natural meaning of the words that statement is wholly incredible. But it may be true if by the annexation of Chitral he meant some slight change in the arrangements which Sir Henry Fowler, before he left office, had made. On one point we agree with Mr. Balfour. Lord Rosebery used an unfortunate argument when he appealed to the possible displeasure of Russia. Russia has no right to be displeased, and it would be very strange if she were so. For so far as her own interests in the matter are antagonistic to ours, Lord Salisbury and his colleagues have taken the very step which a Russian statesman would have desired them to take. It is deeply to be regretted that, as Mr. Balfour thought fit to discuss this subject at a public meeting, he did not more carefully weigh the language he used. He said, for instance, that where the British soldier had once been there he should remain. If this is a reason for the annexation of Chitral, it is a reason for the annexation of Egypt, not to say the conquest of France. And no one can help observing that Mr. Balfour omitted all reference to Lord Elgin's proclamation. He declared that our position in India depended upon our strength. It depends upon nothing of the kind. If the people of India were united against us we could not hold India for a week. British rule in India, as men infinitely wiser and better informed than Mr. Balfour have said over and over again, rests upon India's belief in British justice and honour. If Chitral is to be permanently annexed, as we still hope it is not, a shock will be given to that belief which years may be required to remove. Mr. Balfour rakes from the dust-heap of dead controversies the baleful word "prestige," and announces it to be the foundation of the British Empire. Prestige is not English. It is associated in the minds of all who know its meaning with tricks and dodges. It is a relic of Lord Beaconsfield and the bawling Jingo of the music-hall, which some of Mr. Balfour's most influential colleagues in the present Ministry have denounced with the contemptuous disgust it deserves. —*Daily News*, November 15th.

Mr. Balfour asks the country to take his word for it that the retention of Chitral—an act of downright betrayal and dishonour—is justified by considerations of Prestige (with a capital P), by military arguments which he considers conclusive, and by the welfare of the native tribes. We decline to accept him as an authority, either on military strategy or on the needs of the Chitralese. He has no right to identify the British Empire, which stands above his party, with the doings which have disgraced our administration in India, and if the prestige which he declares essential is to be won by double-dealing and deception the prospects of peace are poor indeed, to say nothing of honour. We say that such language as he held last night is the poorest kind of contribution to international politics. Mr. Balfour would lead us to believe that he is in the secrets of the Russian Foreign Office, and that Prince Lobanoff turns a blind eye to our Oriental moralities. Time will show whether he is deceiving himself.—*Daily Chronicle*, November 15th.

The defence which Mr. Balfour gave of the unhappy decision to retain Chitral was amazingly cocksure, but also amazingly weak. It ought to be unnecessary to remind him that when Lord Rosebery complained of the Chitral Blue-book put forward by the present Government as being "meagre," what he really meant was that it had been cooked and mutilated by the elimination of all expressions of opinion unfavourable to the course on which the Government were bent. Mr. Balfour tells us that the retention of Chitral will involve no addition to the Indian army or to the Indian expenditure. That is not the view of Sir Auckland Colvin or Sir Lepel Griffin, or half a dozen other experts of the first order on Indian financial and frontier policy, and probably another year will not have passed before even Mr. Balfour finds himself unable to maintain it. As to "prestige" and so forth, Mr. Balfour's argument means nothing, or it means that a State can never send a punitive expedition across its frontier without permanently annexing every yard of ground it has temporarily occupied. Lancashire already knows something of the practical consequences of those doctrines, and India, unfortunately, knows still more.—*Manchester Guardian*, November 15th.

Mr. Balfour's remarks on the question of Chitral were most extraordinary. It would be cruel to be too critical of a man who has to make six party speeches in a single day, but nothing can excuse such an outburst as the following:—

> "It is melancholy to think, I might incidentally remark, that the only point on which we have it on high authority that the late Government were unanimous was on a point involving what was discreditable to British honour and British dignity. (Cheers.)"

Considering that half the experts were on one side and half on the other, and considering the illustrious services and honoured names of some of the most distinguished opponents of the forward policy, we are amazed that a responsible Minister should thus brand them as unmindful of British dignity and careless of British honour. The gibe was unworthy of Mr. Balfour. Equally extraordinary was another dictum of Mr. Balfour's on the subject:—

> "We determined (he said) that where the British soldier has been, there we should remain."

A sounding Jingo sentiment; but Mr. Balfour has forgotten the terms of Lord Elgin's Proclamation:—

> "The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present and prevent any future unlawful aggression on Chitral territory, and as soon as this object has been attained the force will be withdrawn."

With that Proclamation in mind, it will seem to some of us that the less said by the Government about British honour in the matter the better. Lord Elgin is indeed an honourable man, and so are they all honourable men, and they have convinced themselves that when Great Britain said "we are not going to stay," she meant "we are going to stay." But as this is a hard saying, to declare that those who were for abiding by the more obvious sense of the Proclamation are insensible to British honour is as ridiculous as it is offensive.—*Westminster Gazette*, November 15th.

The Allahabad correspondent of the *Times*, telegraphing on November 10th, said that the provision in the Jury Bill regarding special verdicts "has alarmed non-official Europeans and natives alike." "The former," he said, "consider that the simple form of trial by jury, according to the English custom should not be tampered with. The native community pin their faith to the report of the Jury Commission, which purposely refrained from from entering upon the question of special verdicts in order to avoid an obvious pitfall."

Review.

BIMETALLISM AND INDIA.

A Treatise on Money, and Essays on Monetary Problems. By J. SHIELD NICHOLSON, M.A., D.Sc. Third edition. London: Adam and Charles Black.

Professor Nicholson takes the opportunity of a third edition to expand his "Treatise on Money" fully one-half, by means of a second part written "with special reference to the influence of the production of precious metals on industry and trade." The importance of such a discussion is so obvious that one rather feels surprised that it was delayed to a third edition. Like the rest of the book, this part is arranged and expounded in an easy progress from simplicity to difficulty, and it must be acknowledged that there is no ambiguity about the author's meaning. The virtues of definiteness and lucidity in economic exposition are sufficiently rare to incline one's mind favourably to Professor Nicholson. If we cannot always see eye to eye with him, that misfortune arises from deeper causes that are not so easily obviated. It should be added that Professor Nicholson conducts his argument with calmness and fairness. The hard blows he deals out to Sir Robert Giffen and the apotheosis of Mr. Goschen are deflections of judgment rather than of temper. The volume, in spite of much wrongheadedness, is calculated to be useful by reason of its plainness, definiteness, and frankness.

It is hardly worth while to allow oneself to be tempted into the general arena of bimetallic controversy. We do not see that Professor Nicholson advances the cause of bimetallism by a single step; and it is futile to discuss what has already been discussed sufficiently for all practical purposes. The unhappy rupee, however, is inevitably brought to the fore, and to it we must give some passing attention. India, indeed, is the real centre of the bimetallic fuss, though Professor Nicholson addresses himself more to the case of the United States than many theorizers do, if not more to the position of other silver-using countries, which are unaccountably left too much in the shade. There is, unfortunately, no manner of doubt about the serious plight of our Eastern Dependency. Professor Nicholson acknowledges, as the facts constrain him to do, that, if the closure of the Indian mints has to some extent succeeded, it has succeeded "only to a limited extent." The operation was a purely artificial one, a hopeless attempt to control natural facts by administrative act. Professor Nicholson does not, so far as we have observed, attempt to show definitely the extent of the success and the failure, or to estimate the permanence of such success as has been achieved. At any rate he is well aware that the yawning void in the Budget has not been filled. We must, of course, take objection to his statement that the deficit has been "caused simply by the fall in the value of the rupee from its old level." We should be the last to under-estimate the effects of the depreciation of the rupee, but we have demonstrated quite conclusively that there are very different factors in the case, which influence the Budget with far more disastrous potency. And even the depreciation of the rupee is to be traced ultimately and essentially to the load of debt that India is called upon to bear. Professor Nicholson must remember that the rupee had begun to go below its nominal value long before the gorged Germans played the wicked trick of 1873. In fact its decline is ominously coincident with the commencement of the English fever of Indian development, which set in soon after the transference of the Government from the East India Company to the Crown. A gold standard, we take it, is quite out of the question.

Professor Nicholson acknowledges the stimulation of Indian exports. Regarding it in connexion with the excessive import of silver, however, he considers it to be an artificial stimulation. He might have usefully elaborated this point, balancing the advantages and the disadvantages. There seems, at any rate, to be no inconsiderable advantage in the fact that the fall of the rupee has enabled the Indian producer to compete with his rivals of Russia, China, and the United States, in the European markets. Hence the Indian's increased power to maintain the London drains on the Calcutta treasury. Hence his larger patronage of the railway system. While the loss on exchange in 1891-92 was Rs.7,800,000 in excess of the Budget estimate, the railways drew some Rs.13,600,000 in excess of their estimate. The compensations must not be omitted from the argument. In fact, it is one of the misfortunes of bimetallic argument that bimetallists concentrate their attention too exclusively on silver and gold alone, to the neglect of the wider world beyond, which conditions the use of silver and gold and the prosperity of nations. Indeed, it may be doubted whether the establishment of bimetallism would not "really do more to ruin Lancashire by the havoc it would play with the interchange of other commodities than a slow fall of the rupee to 6d.;" and it seems very likely "that the rise in the price of commodities which must ensue here could only have the effect of crippling our power to produce manufactures for the world at large, and bring into play new competing forces to oust us from our markets."

The effect of bimetallism on India has been outlined as follows by Mr. A. J. Wilson in the *Investors' Review* (November, 1892):

> "Some inkling of what would happen was afforded to the world by the rise in silver which took place in 1890, when, in consequence of the hopes excited by the silver legislation of the United States, the exchange on India rose from 1s. 5d. to 1s. 8¾d. per rupee within a period of four or five months. The rise half-paralysed the trade of India, and would very soon have made her Government half-bankrupt towards the home creditor. . . . . Were the rise in the exchange to be slow and gradual and also stable, the consequences would be essentially the same, only more bearable, and with compensations. By degrees Lancashire would gain in India at the expense of the native manufacturer; by degrees the Indian cotton grower and wheat or rice grower would find his profits vanish. Indian imports would go up and exports down until, as surely as day follows night, the point would be reached when the Indian Government would no longer be able to draw bills in London on its treasuries in Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. Its resources would rapidly dry up. For a time the debt and other charges due here might be met by exports of silver, or, if Anglo-Indians like it better, of gold, for the precious metals would be the only 'goods' India would have left to sell. If the exchange could be artificially kept up, of course silver would yield the most profit, because India could sell in London dear what she could formerly have bought cheap. But in the end this source also would dry up, and the Government of India must become bankrupt. . . . . There cannot on any impartial review of the facts be a moment's question that this is the end of the career upon which bimetallists and other currency-magic vendors urge the statesmen of this country to enter."

With such a decisive and fully reasoned view of a thoroughly practical (as well as theoretical) economist before one, it is not easy to listen with patience to the narrow disquisition of the arm-chair.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

NOVEMBER, 1895.

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW. Robinson, E. Kay, "Afghan Alliance." Shastri, V., "Brahmanism and the Foundations of Belief."

HARPER'S MAGAZINE. Weekes, E. L., "Recent Impressions of Anglo-Indian Life."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). "On Curious Signatures used by Some Indian Chiefs." R. H., "Travancore."

LEISURE HOUR. Carrington, E., "A Khud in the Punjab."

NINETEENTH CENTURY. Colvin, Sir Auckland, "Indian Frontiers and Indian Finance."

QUARTERLY REVIEW. "Public Opinion in India."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

NOVEMBER, 1895.

WEEKS, LORD EDWIN......................."From the Black Sea through Persia and India." (Osgood, M'Ilvaine.) .... 16s. 0d.

INSECT BITES OR STINGS, CHAFED SKIN, PILES, CUTS, SORE EYES, SUNBURN, EARACHE, NEURALGIC AND RHEUMATIC PAINS, THROAT COLDS, AND SKIN AILMENTS, QUICKLY RELIEVED BY USE OF

CALVERT'S
CARBOLIC OINTMENT.

Large Pots, 1s. 1½d. each (English Rate).

Keeps good in any Climate—Free from Animal Fat.

PRIVATE REPORT FROM LIMASSOL, CYPRUS—
"I have never found anything to come up to it for Neuralgic and Rheumatic pains."

Numerous other favourable reports have been received.

F. C. CALVERT AND CO., MANCHESTER.

KIPLING RUDYARD.................. "The Second Jungle Book." (Macmillan.) .... 6s. 0d.

SCHARLIEB, MARY, M.D., B.S........ "A Woman's Words to Women on the Care of their Health in England and India." (Swan Sonnenschein.) .... 6s. 0d.

MILES, A. H. and PATTLE, A. J....... "Fifty-Two Stories of the Indian Mutiny and the Men who Saved India." [Hutchinson and Co.)...... — —

RUBBEE, KHONDKAR FUZLI............"The Origin of the Mussulmans of Bengal. (Calcutta, Thacker, Spink and Co.)........................ — —

"THE JATAKA; or, Stories of the Buddha's Former Births." (Cambridge University Press.).... 12s. 6d.

SINGH, H H. THE RAJA-I-RAJGAN JAGATJIT OF KAPURTHALA....... "My Travels in Europe and America, 1893." (Routledge.)............ — —

LEITNER, DR. G. W................"The Future of Chitral and Neighbouring Countries, and New Dangers and Fresh Wrongs." (Oriental University Institute, Woking.) .... 4s. 0d.

YOUNGHUSBAND, CAPTAINS G. J. and F. E..... "The Relief of Chitral." (Macmillan.) .... 8s. 6d.

COLLINS, JOHN HOAR.................... "A Plea for the Bimetallic Amalgamation of the Currencies of Great Britain and Hindustan." (Trapps, Holmes, and Co., 13, Farringdon Avenue, E.C.) Paper................... 0s. 3d.

SACRED BOOKS OF THE BUDDHISTS. Translated by various Oriental Scholars, and edited by F. Max Müller. Published under the Patronage of Chulâlankarana, King of Siam. Vol. I. The Gâtakamâlâ or Garland of Birth-Stories, by Arya Sûra, translated from the Sanskrit by J. S. Speyer. (Henry Frowde.) .... 10s. 6d.

THE SAMKYHA-PRAVACANA-BHASYA, or Commentary on the Exposition of the Sankhya Philosophy. By Vijnanabhiksu. Edited by Professor Richard Garbe, Konigsberg University. Being Vol. II. of the Harvard Oriental Series, edited, with the co-operation of various scholars, by Professor Charles Rockwell Lanman. (Published by Harvard University; London, Ginn and Co.) .... 6s. 0d.

RECENT PARLIAMENTARY PAPER.

[C.—7911.] Papers relating to the Grievances of Her Majesty's Indian Subjects in the South African Republic .... 0s. 6d.

CELEBRATED ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF TULSIKRIT RAMAYAN. By Mr. F. S. GROWSE, M.A., C.I.E. Complete in 3 volumes. Fifth Edition. Highly spoken of both by English and Native Press. Also Second-hand books on sale. Price Rs. 3-6 by V.P. Post in India, and 4s. 6d. in England. Apply to Babu HARPRASAD, Municipal Commissioner, Fatehgarh, N.W.P., India.

A.V.C. BROS.
TRY ONCE.

INDIAN SCENTS.
Rare, Jasmine, Thalamboo, and other Attars, R.1 per tola.
Sandal Attar, as.10 per tola.
Pudukota Billais, each as.10.

NOVELTIES IN INDIAN JEWELLERY,
ETC. MADRAS FASHIONS.

ORNAMENTS SET WITH RUBIES.	Rs. Rs.
Kammals ...	100 to 350
Thodus	30—200
Pathakum ...	35—350
Kathiri Bavalies	70—300
Kurudu Bavalies	15— 70
Bullaku	35—250
Nose Screw ...	10— 70
Ear Rings ...	50—300

GOLD ORNAMENTS.	
Kasimalai ...	550—700
Kollikal Addigai	60—150
Kappu (bangle)	150—200
Thodas (chains)	150—200
Jaya Rings ...	15— 25
Vallam Pebbles	3— 25

GOLD HEAD ORNAMENTS.	Rs. Rs.
Gajjulu Nagar ...	35 to 70
Nagar	12—70
Parrot	9—70
Thirugupoo ...	4—7
Half-size do. ...	2-8—7
Sowri Kottai ...	4-8—6-8
Thalamboo ...	2-4—2-8

SILVER JEWELS.	
Golusu (leg chain)	70-120
Chain for watches	7—10
Victor buttons, set	5—6
Locket	3—5
Penholder	3—8
Snuff-box	8—10

All sorts of Silver Versels, Rs.10 to Rs.100.
Bellmetal Kujah, Rs.5 to Rs.10.
Beneres Laced and Silk Cloths, each Rs.6 to Rs.100.
Kornadu, Female Cloth, Rs.8 to Rs.100.
Terms Cash or V.P.P. All other Jewels, etc., will be supplied. Illustrated "Trade Revealer" on application with half-anna postage stamp.
A. V. CHIDAMBARA IYER Bros.
Mayavaram, Madras Presidency, INDIA.

☞ **WANTED.** ☜

5,000 MEMBERS TO

THE HINDU FAMILY PROVISION FUND.

Those who subscribe to "*Arya Vartha*," an English Weekly Journal (Annual Subscriptions for India—Burma Rs. 5, Ceylon, Penang and Straits Rs. 6, Europe 12/-), will be enlisted as a member to the said Fund. Rupees 900 for every paid subscriber to the "*Arya Vartha*" will be equally divided amongst the nominee of the paid subscribers who die within the 31st March of every year. Agreement duly registered.

☞ You need not remit your subscription now. Please register your names. The Journal will be out at Madras as soon as 1,000 members are registered. Rules on application, with ½ anna postage stamp.

MANAGER,
"ARYA VARTHA,"
MAYAVARAM (S. INDIA).

JVARA-HARI.
जरहरि
TRADE MARK.

Is what its name implies, **FEVER DESTROYER,**
and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. WOOD, Captain 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value-payable parcel I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Cuddalo Municipal Councillors' Office.
I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM CARPOOR" 8 ans., 1 Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free.
To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY.
13, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C. AND 27, SECOND LINE BEACH, MADRAS.

Printed by A. BONNER. 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]
[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI. Supplement No. 1. MARCH, 1895.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from February 7th to February 21st.

Imperial Parliament.

February 7th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

REPORT OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

Viscount CROSS gave notice that at an early day he would call attention to the delay which had taken place in the presentation of the report of the Opium Commission. The noble Viscount said the sittings of the Commission were concluded before the prorogation of the last Session; and the House was promised that it should receive the report during the autumn. The report had not, it was quite unnecessary to say, been yet presented to Parliament. It was, in his opinion, very unfair to the Indian Government to be kept so long in ignorance of what the recommendations of the report were. The noble Viscount gave notice that at the same time he would call attention to the apportionment of the cost of the Commission. If India was made to bear one-half of the cost, the burden would be both hard and unfair.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Captain SINCLAIR asked the Secretary of State for India whether the papers in regard to the Indian cotton import duties were ready, and whether they would be laid before the House and circulated to members before the conclusion of the discussion on the Address in reply to the Queen's Speech.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The papers were laid on the Table of the House on Tuesday, and they will be delivered to hon. members to-day.

GRIEVANCES OF THE STAFF CORPS.

Sir SEYMOUR KING asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had yet received an answer from the Government of India to his despatch sent from the India Office at the end of May last year on the subject of the grievances of officers in the Staff Corps:

Whether he was now in a position to lay upon the Table the papers relating to these grievances, including the memorandum submitted to the late Commander-in-Chief and his suggestions thereon:

And whether any decision, and, if so, what, had been arrived at on the subject.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: A reply has been received from the Government of India, and the subject is now under my consideration in communication with the War Office.

THE HEMP DRUGS COMMISSION.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India when the report of the Hemp Drugs Commission would be ready.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The Government of India are considering the report of the Hemp Drugs Commission.

When the report comes home with their observations I will inform my hon. friend.

February 8th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE ABOR TRIBES IN ASSAM.

Mr. HENRY J. WILSON asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had obtained the information asked for by the hon. member for the Holmfirth Division on the 12th June last, namely, whether the treaties concluded with the Abor tribes in Assam in 1862, 1863, and 1866 were still operative:

Whether the British Government was still under obligation to pay yearly to the Meyong Abors eighty bottles of rum and two seers of opium; to the Kebang Abors forty bottles of rum and two seers of opium: to the Abors of Dehang Debang Doars 100 bottles of rum; to the Bor Abors 100 bottles of rum and two seers of opium:

And whether those payments were still made: and, if not, when they ceased to be paid, and what had been substituted.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I have made the enquiry asked for by the hon. member, and learn that the payment of rum and opium, as well as of other dues in kind stipulated for in the treaties, was commuted in 1877 to money payments, aggregating Rs. 3,312 annually.

INDIA OFFICE CONTRACTS,

Mr. LOGAN asked the Secretary of State for India if a large order for cardigan jackets, to be supplied to the army in India, had been given to a Leipsic firm; and, if so, what was the reason for sending such an order out of this country at a time of severe depression in home industries.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: No stores for the Government of India can be ordered in Europe except through the India Office; and no order for cardigan jackets has been issued from the India Office since May, 1892, when a contract for the supply of such jackets was entered into with a Leicester firm.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Mr. RENSHAW asked the Secretary of State for India whether the countervailing excise duty on Indian-made cottons was to be charged only on counts above 21s.; and, if so, whether he could state what proportion the cotton yarn spun in India above 21s. bears to the total annual production of the Indian mills:

Whether it was the case that cotton yarns 21s., or under, spun in India at Bombay, and shipped to the port of Rangoon, would be admitted free of all duty, whilst similar yarn spun in this country would be subject to the duty of five per cent.:

And whether Indian yarn above 21s. would be taxed on its grey value only, whilst dyed yarns exported from this country, as was the case with Turkey red yarns produced in the Vale of

Leven in Dumbartonshire, would have to pay duty on the value of the dyed yarn, and that this would practically make the duty on the Scotch yarn twice as much as the duty on the Indian yarn, and would seriously prejudice the position of the Scotch manufacturers.

Mr. H. H. **Fowler**: (1) The Cotton Duties Act, 1894, imposes excise duty on yarns made in Indian mills of any count above 20s. I cannot give statistics of India-made yarns above 21s., but the papers distributed yesterday show that not more than six per cent. of the yarns made at Indian mills are of counts over 24.

(2) It is the case that no customs duty is payable upon Indian yarns conveyed by sea or otherwise from one part of India to another.

(3) The excise duty is levied on Indian yarns as grey yarns, and customs duty, *ad valorem*, on imported dyed yarns; but I am not prepared to admit the inferences indicated in the hon. member's question. I have forwarded the statement of the Scotch manufacturers on this subject to the Indian Government, and am waiting for their observations thereon.

February 11*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE CANTONMENTS BILL.

Mr. **Walter M'Laren** asked the Secretary of State for India what steps the Indian Government was taking consequent upon the Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the rules, regulations, and practice in the Indian cantonments with regard to the treatment of venereal disease: . Whether legislation was proposed, in conformity with the report of the Committee, in reference to the system of periodical examination of prostitutes, that the only effective method of preventing those systematic practices which have been maintained was by means of express legislation; and, if so, what are the terms of the Bill:

And, how soon was it expected that the Bill would become law.

Mr. H. H. **Fowler**: A Bill dealing with the subjects of my hon. friend's question was introduced into the Legislative Council by the Indian Government last July; the text of the Bill was published in the *Gazette;* and the opinions of the local Governments were, according to the regular practice, obtained. The consideration of the Bill was proceeded with when the Council reassembled in Calcutta, and it was referred to a Select Committee.

I am informed by telegraph that the Bill has now passed with some amendments. I expect to receive copies of the Act by the mail which leaves India this week.

ANGLO-INDIANS AND THE C.D. ACTS.

Mr. **Hanbury**: With reference to the foregoing question, will the right hon. gentleman state whether the Government have received certain representations from the Commander-in-Chief in India with respect to the ravages that have been committed by this class of disease in India, and, if so, whether he will lay those representations on the Table. I would also ask whether it is a fact that the Commander-in-Chief in India, speaking upon the Cantonments Bill two or three days ago, said the admissions into hospitals of cases of such disease in 1893 amounted to nearly 50 per cent. of the entire European force, but that it was impossible to estimate in figures the resulting loss of efficiency, and that it would certainly prove lamentable if an army were tried by long marching or by a severe campaign.

Mr. **Fowler**: I cannot give any answer as to the accuracy of telegraphic reports of what transpires in Calcutta. I have already had an experience of inaccuracy with regard to a telegraphed summary of a speech by the Viceroy. If the newspapers who gave that summary had, in justice to the Viceroy, given the full speech when it came over by mail, it would have been seen that what was really said was precisely the contrary of the meaning conveyed by the telegram.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN INDIA.

On the motion of Mr. **Caine**, there was granted an Address for "Return of the number of persons (1) brought to trial in each province of British India in each year from 1883 to 1892, inclusive, for offences for which capital sentences might be inflicted, specifying those originally tried by the High Court in each presidency town, and those originally tried by the Mofussil Sessions Courts; (2) the number of persons sentenced to death for each offence by the High Courts originally and by the Sessions Courts, also the number of instances in which the capital sentences of the Sessions Judges were upheld, reversed, or commuted by the High Courts as Appellate or Confirming Courts; (3) the number of persons who received other sentences than death or were acquitted; and (4) the number of persons reprieved."

REPORT OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

Mr. **John Ellis** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could now inform the House when it was likely to be in possession of any Report from the Royal Commission respecting the Indian Opium Traffic appointed in consequence of the Resolution of the House of June, 1893.

Mr. H. H. **Fowler**: The Commission have for some weeks been working unremittingly at the preparation of their Report. Some delay is inevitable owing to the residence in India of two of the members; but I have every reason to believe that the House will be in possession of the Report before Easter.

February 12*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EAST INDIA RAILWAY BILL.

In the House of Commons to-night the East India Railway Bill was brought up by Sir James Kitson and Sir George Chesney, and was read a first time.

AMENDMENT TO THE ADDRESS.

INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

MR. NAOROJI AND MR. FOWLER.

Mr. **Naoroji**, resuming the debate on the Address said: I beg to move as an amendment to add the following words, "And we humbly pray that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased to direct your Majesty's Ministers to so adjust the financial relations between the United Kingdom and British India, with regard to all the expenditure incurred in the employment of Europeans in the British-Indian services, civil and military, in this country and in India, that some fair and adequate portion of such expenditure should be borne by the British Exchequer in proportion to the pecuniary and political benefits accruing to the United Kingdom from your gracious sway over India; and that the British Treasury should sustain a fair and equitable portion of all expenditure incurred on all military and political operations beyond the boundaries of India in which both Indian and British interests are jointly concerned." Before I proceed with that I beg to express my regret that in Her Majesty's gracious speeches generally there are no indications of concern or interest in this large empire of India. I do not wish to say anything as to the Government of India except to acknowledge with the deepest gratitude all the good that the British connection with India has done, and if I speak of the officials in India I mean no reflection on them. They are the creatures of circumstances and of a system, and whatever my complaints may be, they will always refer to the system and not to the officials. In moving the amendment, I do not for one moment purpose to ask for any charity, even though we are so poor. All I ask for is that in the name of justice India should be justly treated, should be fairly treated by Britain, and that the latter should pay a fair proportion of the expenditure to which I refer in my amendment. (Cheers.) It is sometimes said that I am an agitator, and that agitation in connection with India is a most undesirable thing. But we have it on the authority of Lord Macaulay that in England you have got a long series of magnificent reforms which we would have got in no other way. Agitation is inseparable from popular Government, and I ask you if the slave trade would ever have been abolished without agitation. Is it not far better that a reform which it is desired should be made should be discussed by peaceful agitation rather than by other and perhaps unfortunate means? In moving this amendment

I appeal to all parties in this honourable House, as there is no party spirit or person in connection with the matter. I appeal to the whole House as Englishmen and as representatives of the British public. There is an expenditure of 700 millions of rupees annually from the revenues of India, and its most important feature is that a portion of it is a drain on the country. We Indians admit the great benefit that Europeans have been to our country, and we do not seek to diminish or minimise that benefit in the slightest degree. The result of this cost is law and order, and India fully appreciates this blessing. But some law and order are absolutely essential to the existence of Europeans in that country as well as to the maintenance of British Rule, and those Europeans derive benefit from both sides. As to this law and order there is one important element in British India and that is that the Hindus, and those who are Muhammadans descended from the Indian race, have in their very nature, in their blood, and in their religious institutions, a love of law and order as an inheritance of some thousands of years. It is necessary that there should be peace and law and order, in order that teaching and learning should continue in the schools of one section of the race, and it is also necessary to the other professional and industrial classes, and to the traders and agricultural classes. All this benefit and interest depends upon law and order being maintained, and it is not their business or to their benefit that they should fight against law or order. To a particular section was left the fighting and protesting business. Consequently you have in India a most important guarantee in the very nature of the people that law and order will be maintained. I wish to propose one test which I will ask you to apply to England in order to realise what I mean. Supposing that England was occupied by a number of foreigners, that the House was occupied by them, and that all the public offices and all important posts and positions were held by them. I am not making a very extraordinary supposition, but I merely do it for a test. You well know that when Julius Cæsar invaded this country, no human being ever dreamt that the savages clothed in paint would become, two thousand years afterwards, the owners of a mighty Empire. Nor would anybody have said that Rome and Italy, which were the masters of the world, would after some few hundreds of years become only geographical names. However, empires have come and gone, so that the supposition I am making is not absolutely impossible. I do not wish it to happen to Britain from the bottom of my heart; I desire that the British people should remain the same as they are, the same lovers of liberty, and the same liberty-giving people;—(hear, hear)—but supposing that by some of the vicissitudes of fortune such a thing occurred, and the British people were subjected to the same domination to which we are subjected. I do not hesitate to say that they would not submit to the evils of such a domination for a single moment or day. We know what they did in the time of the Normans, and I say that you have every reason, and I hope you will always be able, to sing that "Britons never will be slaves." (Cheers.) I ask whether it is the mission of Britons to make others slaves; I hope they will never say that that is their mission. (Hear, hear.) Taking that test, therefore, I appeal to the British people to consider this question very carefully. Sometimes we are told that Britain has secured India by the sword and that she will hold it by the sword. I will not say anything more on that head, but will just observe that the greatest present Indian general has spoken more wisely than many silly persons who have uttered ideas of that kind. Lord Roberts has said that however efficient and great the army may be, were it absolutely perfection and its numbers considerably greater than they are at present, our greatest security must rest on an united and contented India. (Hear, hear.) I hope that that will always be borne in mind. With regard to this law and order, it is absolutely necessary, you must bear in mind, that they should be preserved in the interests both of Indians and of the British people living there: therefore, whatever may be the cost of that law and order, it should not be placed entirely on the heads of the Indians unless they are to be treated as conquered slaves, and the British are to hold them as conquerors and oppressors. If it is not so, then in fair justice I think I may fairly demand that this cost of administration, the result of which is necessary to both, should be fairly divided between the two. (Hear, hear.) What is the Indian's benefit and what is the Briton's benefit. India has to pay to European services in both countries 200 millions of rupees annually. The result of that is that, that money being abstracted from the country and not returned to those who have produced it, the capacity of production goes on diminishing. We have under these circumstances no means of accumulating capital and improving our condition. Hundreds and thousands of millions of money are consumed and carried away in that way, and it places a monopoly of everything in British capital. We cannot compete with it, and the result is that you have not only the benefit of the officials receiving that money, but, under their patronage, of providing British traders, merchants, farmers, shipowners, planters, capitalists, and others. You have naturally a monopoly of all that has to be done, and the profits are all the profits of the British; we work for the British and for British profits, and the Indians are in a way worse off than the Southern slaves, for the reason that those slaves were taken care of and housed and fed by their masters. Further, they did not work on their own property, but the Indians do work on their own property, and give the profits of their work to the capitalists of European countries. The benefits received by the Indian are insignificant when compared with Britain's benefit. I will only say, without labouring the point, that I would assume that the material benefit is equal to the Indian and the British, and that the English people should share equally in the cost. Lord Salisbury accurately described the present position when he said that "India must be bled." There was never a more accurate definition, and the result is that our finance ministers are obliged to complain year after year that the extreme poverty of India has not enabled them to bring the finances of India into a satisfactory condition. On the other hand, let us take a small Native State in which, from certain circumstances, a regency exists. The Minister is then always enabled to speak of the financial condition of that State in the warmest terms. The contrast between the British Indian system and the other was so remarkable that the right hon. gentleman the Secretary of State had to some extent referred to it. But at present, in order to give you an idea of the financial position of India as compared with England, I will speak of only one subject. The right hon. gentleman the Secretary has stated that whereas the taxation of England is £2 11s. 8d. per head, of Scotland £2 8s. 1d., and of Ireland £1 12s. 5d., that of India is only something like 2s. 6d. per head, or one-twentieth that of the United Kingdom. That would mean that the incidence of taxation is extremely light in India. But let us take an illustration. Suppose England was producing £100, and that out of that it gives the Chancellor of the Exchequer £6, or 6 per cent., the incidence in India would then be only one-twentieth, or 3 per cent., very light and small as compared with England or Scotland or Ireland. This is the Anglo-Indian fiction. The fact is that when we consider the incidence of taxation we must consider not only what is the amount paid but what it is compared with the capacity of the people who pay it. An elephant can carry a ton or two, but an ant may be seriously exercised by a grain of wheat. To compare it properly we must see what percentage is taken out of the actual production. The annual production or income in this country per individual is admitted to be something like £35, and the taxation is six or seven per cent. In India the annual production or income is about 20 rupees per annum, per head, and when you consider that you will find that the incidence of taxation is about double—some 14 or 15 per cent. To say, therefore, that India is more lightly taxed is altogether a fiction. (Hear, hear.) The fact is that the pressure of taxation, according to its means of paying, is nearly double that of England. England can afford to pay whilst India is bleeding. This I hope will be clear to the minds of hon. members here; that India derives little benefit from the present system of British administration, and I say that if a system of righteousness were introduced instead of the present system—an inheritance of the last century—England in India would be blessed. The profit of England would be ten times greater, and we, instead of being crushed by that British Indian system would be blessed, and both would benefit. I appeal, therefore, to all hon. members to consider this question carefully and to realise that if the British Empire is to exist for the benefit of both they must let the principles of right and justice govern it. (Cheers.) I am willing, however, for the sake of argument, to accept the statement that our benefit is equal to the British benefit, but, even granting that, I may fairly ask that Britain may fairly share half the bill, and of the cost of producing the result from which both profit equally. But my amendment does not go so far as that. I do not ask for even half of the whole amount. I only ask for a portion of that part of the expenditure which is really incurred on Europeans and that entirely for British rule. If it were not for British rule and for the necessity of maintaining it, there would be no necessity for Europeans, and we should not be drained in the manner we are. It has been declared by Lord Roberts that "the prosperity of the United Kingdom is bound up with the retention of that great Empire." Lord Kimberly has said, "We are resolutely determined to maintain our supremacy over our Indian Empire, and he added that that among other things rested upon the maintenance of our European Civil Service, and also upon the magnificent European forces which we maintained in that country." I am rather surprised that the lesson has been so soon forgotten. The European Civil Service is the weakest part in your maintenance of your rule there, for when the unfortunate troubles arose in 1857 the European civil servants and all the civil Europeans were the greatest difficulty. They must be saved; they were in the greatest danger in the midst of thousands and thousands of hostile people; and to suppose that the civil Europeans in such times could be a strength is contrary to common sense. Your security depends upon giving satisfaction to the people of India on this matter. You may create an empire by brute force, but you will never maintain it except by moral force founded on justice and righteousness. (Hear, hear.) I say, therefore. that if I asked that even the whole expenditure in regard of Europeans should be defrayed by the British Exchequer I would not be far wrong. I would be amply justified. It is for your benefit especially that you want this European element in the country. But for the sake of argument. I will accept that the benefit of the employment of Europeans. whether in the Military or Civil Service, is equally enjoyed by the natives of India, and then I say that half of this expenditure at least should be paid from the British Exchequer. We are sometimes threatened that if we raise the question of the financial relations of India and Great Britain something will have to be said about the navy. But apart from paying a fair share for the vessels stationed in India on this point I need not quote a single opinion. Every speech made from this side or that side has acknowledged that for the protection of this United Kingdom alone you require a navy equal to the navies of any two of the European countries. You require every inch, every ounce of your navy for yourselves, and that you should ask for any payment on this account from us would be something very strange. (Hear, hear.) The sense of justice has prohibited, has prevented any such demand being so far made. But I may remind you that as to this navy the glory and gain is all your own. There is not a single Indian employé in it, and would it be just and fair to ask us to pay any portion of the cost under those circumstances? Lastly, we are told that this navy is necessary to protect British-Indian commerce as well as other commerce. There is not a single ship belonging to Indians going from India to other parts, or bringing cargo to India which is really an Indian ship. The whole shipping is British shipping. Not only that, but the whole cargo while afloat is at the risk of British money. There is nothing exported from India upon which British money does not rest through the East India banks. If I export 100 bales of cotton from India. I go to an East India bank and give the bill of lading to the bank and the bank gives me a price, within say 5 per cent. as a margin, and the risk, while the cargo is afloat is entirely on the money of the bank, which is British money. And in the same way when goods are exported from here, a similar process is gone through with a British bank, and it is British money which is risked on the transaction. I put it whether under the circumstances which I have detailed as briefly and quickly as possible, it is not a fact that if some of the benefits of British rule are allowed to be Indian benefits, some are purely European benefits, and therefore I say that a portion of the expenditure should be defrayed by the British Exchequer. Whilst dealing with this subject I may say that there are several returns which I asked for again and again but have not yet obtained. If the right hon. gentleman will give us those returns we shall be able to judge as to the real material condition of the people of India. Till those returns are made we shall never be in such a position. Whilst sitting at the meeting some time ago on the subject of the Armenian atrocities, I admired very highly the efforts that the English always make for the protection of the oppressed or the mitigation of their sufferings. May I appeal to the same British people that they will also consider the case of the people of India. Millions on millions in India are living in a state of semi-starvation. When the British people have the information which will enable them to realise that they will surely have some compassion on their own fellow-subjects and look into the matter carefully. They will surely ask why, after a hundred years of administration by most highly praised and highly paid officials, the condition of India is such that India is not able to pay even one-thirteenth part of that taxation which the people of Ireland, poor Ireland pay. This is not to your glory. (Hear, hear.) Are you satisfied with such results? While your wealth has gone on increasing by leaps and bounds we, according to the declaration of the Secretary for India, have not one-twentieth the capacity of Englishmen for taxation. You pay in drink more than £3 to £4 a head. We cannot even produce anything like that amount. Our whole production is not two pounds a head, or, if you take the present rate of exchange, it is only 20s. Such should not be the result of that system which has been expected to be a beneficial system. We should be in a position which, if it were not so good as yours, should still be a position of prosperity. The late Mr. John Bright once said, "There are two ways of benefitting ourselves—one by plunder, and the other by trade." And he said that he preferred the method of trade. But you do not follow that principle. You bleed us; and you cannot whilst you do that benefit yourselves in any real sense—you cannot certainly have a large trade. What is the extent of the trade of this country with India? It is a most miserable quantity. The amount of British produce sent to India is hardly worth 2s. per head, per annum, of the population of India, while if India were prosperous you would have a very good trade indeed. You would not then have any necessity to complain about these cotton duties, and about the want of a market. (Hear, hear.) You seek a market among the poor African savages—(Oh!)—in order to create more markets for yourselves, but there in India is a market of three hundred millions of civilised people, and if you allowed them to develop their resources you would not have to complain. You might then eliminate the word "unemployed" from your dictionaries. You would hardly be able to meet the largeness of their demands. If only we took what was equal to £1 per head of the population of India, you would be able to export to us as much as you are exporting to the whole world at present, and you would have our blessing upon it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said the other day that where injustice and wrong prevail as they have prevailed in Armenia, a Liberal Government always called upon and obtained the co-operation of the European powers in order to redress the wrong. May I appeal to you to extend similar consideration to the condition of India also. The right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian made a very noble speech on his birthday in reference to the Armenians. I need not quote it. But I appeal to him and all who are of like mind with him that they will give consideration to those to whom they are more tied by duty—who are their fellow-subjects. Let them show that they do not think that we should be treated as mere helots—that they do not think that we should be bled; that the evils do not exist because of the intention of British people, but because of the official system which has been so deeply rooted in the country, and that they will do their best to put the system on the lines of justice. (Hear, hear.) I ask for no charity—for no subsidy. (Hear, hear.) I ask for common justice. I ask that if we are indeed partners with you and derive a proportion of benefit we should pay in proportion to the benefit. The next part of my amendment is with regard to any expenditure which may be incurred outside the boundaries of India. If you conquer Burma, or go to Siam or China, you should not make us pay. When the Burmese war was declared, we sent a telegram to the Viceroy that the war should be considered as a war on your own account. We say the same now in respect to any warlike expenditure beyond our borderland. Certainly whenever such a thing takes place, you are bound in justice to defray at least half of the expenditure. You have already in one case admitted and acted on that principle. During the last Afghan War, which was certainly not only for the sake of the protection of British India, but also of British rule, with regard to the expenses of that war, Mr. Fawcett and Mr. Gladstone fought for the expenditure not to be wholly put upon India, and when the Liberal Government afterwards came in it was decided that at any rate a portion—one-fourth—of the expenditure should be defrayed from the British Exchequer. That in these cases the whole expenditure should be thrown upon India is not worthy of British honour. I therefore appeal with every confidence. Whatever may be the difference of opinion with regard to various Indian matters, on this one point of expenditure which is for the benefit of both—and often, as it has been pointed out, a great deal more for your benefit than for ours—a portion, say one-half, of the expenditure on the European services should be paid by the British Exchequer. I hope that I shall not appeal in vain. Indeed I know that whenever any appeal is made on the principle of justice and honour, the British people will fairly and fully respond to it. (Hear, hear.) I will not take up more of the House's time. I am much obliged to members of the House for the very kind attention which they have given to me. (Hear, hear.) I will only make one more remark by way of illustration. It is with regard to this question of the import duty. That again illustrates our helpless condition. What is this import duty? The British Indian Government by one stroke of the pen ordered a million of money to be given to the well-to-do European services from the wretchedness of the poor Indians. But to order that million to be paid and to get the money were two different things, and the British Indian Government said, like Lord Salisbury, that as the rural population had already been bled they had better now bleed some portion of the well-to-do. That could only be done by this kind of duty. But the Indian Government saw that it would be an indirect way of bleeding the Native States also. This will be a transit duty. Different kinds of goods imported into India must go through British ports, and some of the goods passing through them into the Native States will be obliged to pay some of the duty. I am not, however, discussing the subject of the duty itself. That question is to be separately brought forward, and then I shall be able to say what I have to say on that subject. All I wish to point out is the gravity of the situation as regards the taxing of India. The Government of India say, "we wish to bleed India in this part." The Lancashire people say, "No, you must bleed in this other part." (Hear, hear, and laughter.) And thus we have the unseemly squabble. Unfortunately, while we have no voice we cannot touch or restrict the expenditure a single farthing. The Government are arbitrary and can do what they like. We have what is called a Legislative Council where the Budget is produced, but we must accept it. We have no voice in determining its character. My present appeal, therefore, is for justice, for righteousness. If certain advantages are derived by India from the British rule, and certain advantages obtained by Great Britain from that rule, the cost of the respective advantages should be fairly shared by both. That is the course which alone will be worthy of the British people. Again, I say I hope that I shall not make this appeal in vain. (Cheers.)

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN: I beg to second the amendment of my hon. friend, and at the same time I must express my great regret in similar terms that no reference to India has been made in the course of Her Majesty's Gracious Speech. The people of India are in a condition of extreme anxiety as to what the nature will be of the promised financial inquiry to which reference was made at the close of last Session. They are anxious to know whether that inquiry is really to go to the root of the matter; whether it will be a genuine attempt to learn the true causes of, and to apply a real remedy to, the disastrous financial condition of the country. (Hear, hear.) In this anxiety we may truly say many members of this House share. (Hear, hear.) I would particularly refer to those hon. gentlemen who represent Lancashire constituencies—(hear, hear)—because they are deeply interested in Indian finance in relation to the imposition of duties upon Lancashire goods. It cannot be too distinctly understood that the imposition of these import duties is a direct result of the excessive expenditure—administrative expenditure in India. The imposition of this new tax is simply one incident in the downward course of Indian finance. It is one of the stages of the rake's career. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) We have had one or two other notable stages in that career. We have had the closing of the mints which has convulsed exchanges all over the civilised world, and we have had the misappropriation of the Famine Fund which was designed to relieve the distress of the starving people. Therefore, I would ask the hon. members for Lancashire to say that this excessive expenditure should stop, and then the necessity for import duties, whether on cotton or anything else, would cease. (Hear, hear.) I think other hon. members are also very much interested to know the terms of this reference. I think that members who are interested in India, and may perhaps be asked to take a part in this Select Committee would like to know whether this inquiry is to be one of real benefit to India and to this country. (Hear, hear.) I do not think that they will be very willing to give their time and their labour if it is to be a mere book-keeping enquiry. (Hear, hear.) If it is to be of no more value than these bogus audits of the Liberator type—("Oh" and laughter)—I do not think that hon. members will be willing to give their labour to it. We do not want a mere bogus audit at all. We want to go into the whole facts of the case—to know what are the causes of the financial difficulty and what are the real remedies by which the finances of India can be put on a good and sound basis. (Hear, hear.) And in order to get at the real facts, we challenge inquiry upon certain points. We make four important propositions, and we invite my right hon. friend the Secretary of State to allow us to prove those propositions, or do our best to do so. These are the following. The first is that the condition of the people of India is one of extreme poverty. The second is that the burden of taxation is crushing the people of India, and is more than they can bear. The third is that the proceeds of this taxation are being employed upon useless and mischievous frontier wars, and the fourth is that if this useless military expenditure were stopped, it would not be necessary to impose import duties—that it would be possible even to remove a certain amount of the existing taxation, and to provide funds to meet extreme needs in the way of famine, and for the progress and welfare of the Indian people. (Hear, hear.) How does the Secretary of State deal with these propositions? How does he propose to deal with this great question of the condition of the Indian people? We think it a very dreadful thing here in this country—in London—that there should be a submerged tenth, but in India we have a submerged fifth—a fifth of the people who have only one meal a day. As has been stated, they never have their hunger satisfied. How has the Secretary of State met this demand for inquiry into the condition of the people. He refuses to go into the question of revenue altogether, and he has only offered us an inquiry into expenditure. It appears to me that the proper logical course is to take income first and expenditure afterwards. (Hear, hear.) It seems a very curious thing to inquire how much we ought to spend before we know how much we have got to spend. If a private individual is in pecuniary difficulties and wants to get his affairs put straight, he first ascertains what his income is. If he is a large landowner, he ascertains whether his farmers can pay their rents, and after finding out what he may reasonably expect his income to be, he is able to decide what his expenditure can reasonably be. In the same way as regards India—we do not deny that a fair amount of value has been received, but we say that the expenditure is upon a scale too large for India. We say that India should cut her coat according to her cloth. When the right hon. gentleman enables us to ascertain how much income she really and properly has we shall be able to say how much she can reasonably spend. Therefore we very much regret that the India Office declines to go into the question of the revenue, and to enable us to judge of the capacity of the Indian people to bear taxation, or of the amount of taxation that can reasonably be raised from India. I think that this inquiry is all the more necessary—and I say it with great regret—because my right hon. friend appears to be possessed with such a spirit of optimism, and to take such a very rosy view of the condition of the Indian taxpayer, and also of the financial condition of the people of India. It appears to me that to take any such optimistic view is a dangerous delusion. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend the member for Finsbury (Mr. Naoroji) pointed out that the maximum estimate of the average income of the Indian people was 27 rupees per head, or something like 1½d. a day. What is there out of that to tax? (Hear, hear.) Where is the surplus that you can tax? You must remember the great rayat class. They have no savings. They, in fact, have less than nothing because they are terribly in debt to the village money-lender, and have no reserve of food at all. A single failure in the harvest produces starvation and death by hunger to hundreds of thousands and even to millions of these people. How are a people like that to bear taxation? And how are they to be said to be lightly taxed if they are paying nearly double in proportion to what is paid by the inhabitants of this wealthy country, who, as we know, themselves find it hard enough to pay as it is. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, we say that the condition of the Indian people cries loudly for most careful inquiry. And I think my right hon. friend takes, similarly, a too favourable view of the financial condition of the Government of India. He has said that it is absurd to talk about its being insolvent, although we know it is very difficult to find money to pay current expenses; and I would draw the attention of the right hon. gentleman to a very interesting and authoritative article in the *Nineteenth Century* by Sir Auckland Colvin, the former Minister of Finance for India, in which he says that unless this military expenditure on aggressive operations is stopped there will be only three alternatives before the Indian Government. Those alternatives are either that the British Treasury should come in to help, or that the people should be further taxed, in addition to their existing taxes, or else that the Indian Government should be declared bankrupt. Those are the three alternatives which he puts before us, and I think in face of that it can hardly be safe to take a rosy view of Indian finance. As regards the state of that finance I will only state one fact which will show to the House the dire straits in which the Government of India now are. That fact is that they have imposed the import duties which are giving such very great dissatisfaction throughout the important district of Lancashire. I do not suppose anyone will think that Ministers of the Crown would be willing to excite the anger of Lancashire members if they had not found that it was impossible otherwise to meet their liabilities. They must have squeezed the Indian people pretty dry before they came and asked Manchester to help them with money. And in this connection I hope I may be excused if I say one word to the hon. members who sit for Lancashire divisions, and if I beg them to be so good as to consider the unfortunate position of the Indian taxpayer in this matter. The Indian taxpayer does not want to have import duties imposed. He has asked to have them, but only as the lesser of two evils, because, as has been pointed out, the import duties will fall chiefly upon the wealthier classes, and also because they constitute an indirect tax which causes a minimum of of oppression in its collection. The taxpayers of India, I repeat, are only asking to have the form of taxation which will be the least painful to them. They prefer to be chastised with whips rather than with scorpions; and they beg as a matter of favour to be allowed to pay 5 per cent upon their imported goods rather than to have an increase of the duty upon salt, which is now 1,000 per cent. upon a commodity which is consumed every day by the very poorest of the poor. Therefore, I would say to the members who represent Lancashire constituencies, Do not use all your great influence to secure that the burden, which must be borne by these poor people, shall be imposed in the way that will be the most killing, the most maiming, the most crushing to the poorest classes among them." I would appeal to the great and noble policy that is connected with the names of Manchester and of Mr. John Bright, who was the friend of India first, and of all other interests afterwards; and I would ask the hon. members of Lancashire divisions to attain their object, which is the same object as ours, by joining hands with us in asking for a reduction of expenditure which is making these import duties necessary. If they will help us to reduce the expenditure they will gain the gratitude of the whole of India and will make unnecesary import duties on cotton goods or anything else. My appeal to have this reduction of expenditure is based on the contention that it is actually mischievous; because in carrying on the aggressive expeditions which make it necessary, we are abandoning the good old safe policy of Lord Lawrence. The policy of Lord Lawrence was that India ought to remain within her natural bounds and barriers, and that the basis for a safe defence of India lay in the contentment of the people themselves, in friendly neighbours, and in a full treasury. But the effect of these aggressions beyond the frontier is that we have an empty treasury, that we have filled our neighbours with fear and hatred and that within our borders we have people who are overtaxed and consequently more or less discontented. Therefore we say, let us stop this policy and revert to the good old policy formerly pursued, and then India will be as prosperous as my hon. friend has prophesied—and not only will she be prosperous herself, but she will be the cause of prosperity among the toiling millions of this country. I beg to second the amendment.

MR. FOWLER: There was one sentence in the speech of my hon. friend, the mover of the amendment, in which I cordially agree. He stated that India asks for no charity, no subvention, but that her claim is for justice; and I can assure him that this Government, the Government which preceded it, and I am satisfied the Government which may follow it, will, as English statesmen, have no wish but to treat India with the strictest, I may say, the most generous, justice. My hon. friend said he made his motion in no party spirit. I believe and accept that statement, and I can conceive no greater calamity that could happen to Indian interests and to our Indian Empire than that it should ever be one of the shuttlecocks with which the party game of battledore is played. (Hear, hear.) We want to keep party out of Indian affairs altogether. (Cheers.) The people of this country have undertaken or have had placed upon them a great trust; and I believe, in direct opposition to the statement of the mover and seconder of this amendment, that the first has hitherto been faithfully discharged, has been justly discharged, and has been honourably discharged. (Hear, hear.) I believe it has conferred unspeakable benefits upon the people of India, and though no one is more ready than I am to admit that there are many points in which improvement is desirable and that there are many spheres in which financial reform can be wisely extended, in which expenditure can be reduced, and in which increased efficiency can be secured, yet I must express my strong dissent alike from the facts and the figures and the conclusions of my two hon. friends who have brought this motion forward. I am sure that my hon. friend the mover of the resolution did not even himself believe that at the present day the people of India are, under British rule, suffering grosser outrages and more acute wrongs than those it is alleged the people of Armenia suffer under Turkish rule; and I would put it to him, as to a friend of India and one who desires, as he has told us, to secure perfectly amicable relations between these two great Empires, whether he thinks it is wise for him to use in the British House of Commons words—words which will no doubt be translated and transmitted for the reading of the whole of the people of India—indicating that there is a man in this House who actually believes that the people of India are at this moment suffering at the hands of the Queen-Empress and her officers wrongs which can be compared if only in a thousandth degree, to those which the people of Armenia are alleged to be suffering at the present time at the hands of the Turks. (Hear, hear.) I am sure that was a mistake on the part of my hon. friend, and consequently I will pass it by; and I will also pass by all his allusions to what he calls a conquered people, and his suggestion that they are treated as slaves and helots. That is not, I believe, the the opinion of the people of India, I am sure it is not in harmony with the facts of the case. (Hear, hear.) But my hon. friend gave us two or three sets of figures; and perhaps after inquiring into the accuracy of those figures, I may be regarded as justified in criticising to some extent the accuracy of his conclusions. It is in reference to those figures that so largely incorrect views are put before the public mind, but I will only call attention to two or three statements which my hon. friend made in the course of his speech. In the first place he said we were dealing with an expenditure of seventy millions. Now I drew the attention of the House last year to the fact that those very large sums include a great variety of incomes and expenditures which have no application to public expenditure and taxation as we understand those words in this country. If you were to include in the English Budget the whole of the rents of the United Kingdom, the traffic receipts of every railway and every canal, and an enormous amount of public works which in themselves produce an income that discharges the entire cost of their construction, you would pile up the English Budget from a hundred millions to a thousand millions—(Hear, hear)—and then you might say you had such a sum to deal with. Now I ventured to submit to the House six months ago, that no one can deny the statement that the real net revenue and expenditure of India are about fifty millions, and not what my hon. friend mentioned. I was specially sorry to hear him say what I will next refer to, because it is a statement which may be misunderstood, and may produce in many minds a feeling of the existence of extravagant injustice. Though the statement has at first sight some justification it is not based on the facts of the case. My hon. friend told the House that out of the revenue of India the people were called upon to pay Rx. 20,000,000 to English officials. The conclusion that anyone would draw from that statement would be that the ordinary civil expenditure of the Government of India includes something like that sum for salaries. Let me tell the House exactly what was the cost of the establishment in India some six years ago, when the figures were taken. The cost of our Civil Establishment at that time was Rx. 11,726,000, and of that sum over six millions was paid to natives.

Mr. NAOROJI: We have a return of the salaries of a thousand rupees and upwards paid to officials; and from that return and from correspondence I have had with the Office itself, it will be found that all the salaries and pensions will come to nearly two hundred million rupees.

Mr. FOWLER: I can only express my dissent from those figures. I come down to officers receiving 250 rupees, which practically covers the whole Civil Service of India. I would here mention another fact which, perhaps, is not very germane to the matter before us; but, in view of the statements made from time to time to the effect that the entire administration of India is entrusted to Europeans, it will be interesting if I give the House the proportions of that large army of public servants, Europeans and Natives, who discharge their duties with so much care, ability and efficiency. There are 7,991 Europeans, 5,347 Eurasians, and 119,514 Natives.

Mr. NAOROJI: What do you pay to each?

Mr. FOWLER: Let me go on to another statement which my hon. friend made, and which was, to a certain extent, endorsed by the seconder of the amendment—a statement with reference to the incidence of taxation. I did not understand my hon. friend to give correctly the answer I returned to the hon. member for Flintshire. I think the hon. member for Flintshire asked me whether I excluded the land revenue when I stated that the taxation of India was the figure which has been quoted. Well, I do not any more consider the land revenue taxation than I consider the rent of any man's house taxation; and I have the authority of John Stuart Mill and Professor Fawcett upon the point. That being so, how much of this taxation falls upon the people of India, that is, of this fifty millions I have been talking about? There are in India tax and non-tax revenue. You must again divide the fifty millions by one half to get to the tax revenue, and when we are told that the people of India are unable to pay their taxation I can only repeat to the House what I said last year, that the only tax which an Indian peasant need pay—and I am sorry he has to pay that—is the tax upon salt. I have never for a moment defended that tax; I said last year that I should be exceedingly glad to see it repealed, and, like the seconder of the Resolution, who spoke so confidently as to what the Indian public desire, I am satisfied that if our expenditure admitted of a reduction of taxation, the Indian nation would demand not the repeal of the customs duties but rather the repeal of the salt tax which presses so heavily upon the poorer classes of the people. The salt tax, which everybody in India is obliged to pay, amounts to 5 annas, or 5d., per head. Next, my hon friend referred to the Navy, and said it was a monstrous thing that India should have to contribute towards the cost of that Service. I wish my hon. friend knew something of the inner life of the India Office on this question. There is a great controversy going on between the India Office and the Admiralty and the Treasury with reference to the contribution which the first-named should make to the Navy; and so acute has become the difference of opinion between my right hon. friends the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the First Lord of the Admiralty and myself that we have referred the matter to arbitration. (Laughter.) Originally we had hoped that a very distinguished member of the other House, the Duke of Devonshire, would have been able to undertake the task of arbitrating between us; but he has been unable to undertake the duty, and we have agreed to refer it to one in whom we have the greatest confidence, whose judgment we shall be bound to respect, and who will look on all the points involved with the greatest justice and judgment—the matter is now referred to the decision of the Prime Minister. Now let me give the House the figures. We are contributing now—the India Office are paying—£50,000 and no more for what we may call the police of the Indian Seas. I am not going to say too much about that, or the Chancellor of the Exchequer may say that I am using a very good argument why we should pay more; but my hon. friend says: "You have no such thing as Indian commerce; it is the commerce of Great Britain;" and he drew a glowing picture of the state of affairs which would come into being if England were expelled from India, when there would be an enormous trade in India. I do not know what the trade of India was before the East India Company was there, and I will not trouble the House by stating what the figures were 20 or 30 or 40 or 50 years ago; but, dealing with the value of merchandise imported into, and exported from, British India by sea from and to foreign ports, excluding Government stores, excluding all the fearful drain which we are told India suffers as a result of British government, I find that in the year 1892-3, which was not a particularly prosperous year, India bought £79,000,000 worth sterling of merchandise and India sold £113,000,000 worth. If that is what my hon. friend calls "no Indian commerce" my ideas of what is commerce differ widely from his. Before coming to the amendment itself, let me say a word or two in reply to the speech of the seconder, who, I am bound to say, did not very accurately approach the wording of the amendment itself. He first charged us with having, by closing the mints, convulsed the exchanges of the world. I am not going to open the bimetallic question this evening. I will spare myself and spare the House, and I am almost afraid even to utter my next sentence for fear it should prove a temptation to someone who may follow me to embark upon that troubled sea. But do not bring me in with Lancashire, with the exchanges of the world, or with my friends on the other side who think we ought to have pursued a different currency policy. All I wish to say is that the closing of the mints has been a great pecuniary advantage to India. Since I have been in office I have had the figures taken out month by month of the coining or melting value of the rupee and of its currency value, and the percentage between the two is one of those accurate uniform laws which seem to pervade the whole realm of statistics—which you can wonder at and note, but which you cannot define. Practically it has not varied during the whole of that period anything like a fraction per cent. There has been one uniform difference of 20 per cent., or 19 and a decimal very nearly approaching that figure—which the Government of India has received more for its Bills through the closing of the mints. Up to the end of January I should have been nearly two and a quarter million worse off than I am if those mints had not been closed, and that money would of course have had to be found from some other source of taxation. Then my hon. friend made another remark which I think was not warranted and was not just to the House or just to himself. We had last year a very full debate upon the Famine Fund. I know there are those who contend that the surplus of revenue over expenditure ought not to be applied to any purpose except purposes connected with famine and famine relief works and productive railway and irrigation works. No one knows better than my hon. friend that the vast scheme of works which was contemplated ten or twelve years ago are now completed, and that nothing further of a large character is needed at present. They have been provided for out of that fund, But the hon. member used the words "misappropriation of the Famine Fund." I am not the Finance Minister of India, but I am the representative in this House of that Finance Minister, and I say that this is a phrase which ought not to be used in regard to the head of any Finance Department unless the user of it is prepared to prove it up to the very hilt. (Cheers.) "Misappropriation" is a very ugly word to use in connection with finance. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend compared the Committee which we have offered, and which we are anxious to see sitting, to a bogus audit. What does that mean? I do not know. *Does it mean* dishonest auditors auditing accounts dishonestly and giving a dishonest report of what has been done? I do not see any similarity between a bogus auditor and a Committee of this House, and I cannot accept the very severe and harsh criticisms which my hon. friend has passed upon this offer. These are the general features of the case. What is it that my hon. friend the mover of this resolution asks? He asks that Her Majesty will be pleased to direct the Government "to so adjust the financial relations between the United Kingdom and British India with regard to all the expenditure incurred in the employment of Europeans in the British Indian services, civil and military, in this country and in India"—therefore, I suppose, that includes every British soldier and every British civilian—"that some fair and adequate portion of such expenditure should be borne by the British Exchequer in proportion to the pecuniary and political benefits accruing to the United Kingdom from your gracious Majesty's sway over India." If the amendment had stopped at the words British Exchequer, I do not mean to say that that would not be a question deserving of inquiry, though I do not understand my hon. friend's constitutional mode of attaining his object for he is proposing a serious change in the Government policy in India, and it would require the authority of an Act of Parliament and not of a minister to make it. Then my hon. friend goes on: "And that the British Treasury should sustain a fair and equitable portion of all expenditure incurred on all military and political operations beyond the boundaries of India in which both Indian and British interests are jointly concerned." What is to be the tribunal which is to accurately adjust the balance and to say what is a "fair and equitable portion?"

An hon. member: The Duke of Devonshire.

Mr. H. Fowler: My hon. friend suggests the Duke of Devonshire, but I do not know whether he, or I, or anybody, would take the liberty. No one man or any ordinary number of men could determine a question so difficult as the pecuniary and political benefits derived between two parts of a great Empire for the mother country. (Hear, hear.) I do not for a moment say that we have not derived great benefits from our connection in India. But at the same time India has derived great benefits from her connection with England. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend in the course of his speech states that that there was no capital for improving the condition of the people of India. Where did the capital come from which constructed the Indian railways and the Indian canals, which have changed the whole face of India and conferred such benefits upon civilisation as have not been conferred on any other country in Asia. (Cheers.) I dare say that no other country in the world in so short a period of time has got so much from British capital. (Cheers.) It has come from here, it is British capital.

Mr. W. S. Caine: And from Indian taxes.

Mr. H. Fowler: I hope my hon. friend the member for Bradford will abstain from these interruptions. I carefully abstain from interrupting him. (Hear, hear.) I do not know whether my hon. friend wishes to penalise the employment of Europeans. He speaks of the employment as if it were a crime and a calamity that Europeans have taken part in the administration of the country. That, I do not think, will be the opinion of this House. (Hear, hear.) I do not think it will be the opinion either of England or of India that the distinguished, I will not say generals, but distinguished soldiers and civilians and that vast army of English public servants who have, during the last century been carrying on the affairs of India are a class of men of which this country has reason to be ashamed or of which India has any ground of complaint. (Cheers and interruptions). My hon. friend who dissents can deal with the point when he gets up to reply to me. It is not fair for him to interrupt me in the course of my speech as he is doing, I have not the experience in making public speeches which my hon. friend has—(laughter)—and I think that if he were subjected to these interruptions, even he would feel at some disadvantage. (Hear, hear.) Now what is practically the proposal of the resolution? We are asked to agree to some apportionment between the two countries. Coming to the practical part of the controversy, I am quite ready to admit that very serious differences have arisen between England and India: between, in fact, the two Exchequers, with reference to this apportionment, not on the principls of pecuniary and political benefit, but on the wider principle of justice between the two countries. Personally I am not at all prepared to dissent from a great many of the conclusions at which my hon. friend arrived. (Hear, hear.) This is not the first time that this question has been raised. I may remind my hon. friend that a Committee sat a great many years ago at the instance of Mr. Fawcett and Mr. Fawcett recommended a careful consideration of the question. Immediately after that Committee broke up, which was in 1874, a Departmental Committee was appointed of which the late Mr. Bouverie was chairman, but the report of that Committee was so unfavourable, and as India thought, so unjust, that it was practically impossible either for the Government here to impose, or for India to accept, the proposed returns. That was the result of that inquiry. Immediately after that had failed, India still being dissatisfied, and I think justly dissatisfied with this apportionment of what are called Home Charges, a departmental inquiry took place under the auspices of the present Lord Derby who was then Financial Secretary to the Treasury, the Committee including Lord Northbrook and Mr. Knox of the War Office. That Committee had the subject under consideration for fourteen years and during that period it issued a long series of reports, every one being accepted both by the Exchequer and by the India Office. But I should be deceiving the House if I did not say that Lord Northbrook when the Commission closed was dissatisfied with the state of matters, and that the Duke of Argyll, certainly no small authority on these matters, was also dissatisfied, he being at that time Secretary of State. If the House will allow me I will quote the remarks of my own predecessor, Lord Kimberley, upon this question, to show that this is no party question, and that Secretaries of State like the Duke of Argyll and Lord Kimberley and a Viceroy like Lord Northbrook were agreed that there is a substantial, reasonable, and just ground of complaint as between India and England in reference to the question of military costs. This is what Lord Kimberley said in the House of Lords: "Upon this question of general policy which I have been invited to discuss, I do not think it at all safe to express very confident views. As to the share that India should bear of the expenses of expeditions out of that country, it appears to me that if India is really interested in an expedition it is right that that country should contribute a fair amount towards the cost of it. It is impossible to decide upon such matters beforehand. They must be dealt with at the time. All I can say is that we think India should be fairly and generously dealt with, and not charged with the cost of these expeditions unless she has a distinct interest in them. With regard to Egypt, for instance, India has a very considerable interest. . . . The question of Military Charges is incapable of any complete solution; but it is one which I am quite certain successive Viceroys and Secretaries of State will continue to press upon the Home Government—that is, that we should not have to bear so large a share of the Army expenses. We must try to reduce them, but I am not very sanguine that we shall be able to do so. We shall not fail at the India Office to do our utmost to keep these charges within a reasonable amount. I should like to quote what the Duke of Argyll said as to the real gravamen of the charge. He said: "We have only to consider what India would have been but for English rule to see the enormous benefit she has derived from it. It is no exaggeration to say that our government of India is such a government as the world has never seen before. The Roman Empire in its greatest extent was not so wonderful. We govern 180,000,000 men of opposite races and religions, sometimes fanatically opposed to each other, and governed them more quietly, calmly, and peacefully than we could govern our own people in Ireland. I desire to say nothing which would diminish the loyalty and sense of obligation which the Indian people feel and ought to feel towards us; and it would have the worst possible effect if there were any suspicion aroused in India that, for the purposes of making convenient Budgets or of party government, the people of India were being charged with expenses which ought really to be defrayed by the Home Government." That is really the chief point of my hon. friend's complaint. The amendment asks me to direct an apportionment of certain military charges between England and India.

Mr. Naoroji: Not merely the Military Charges but also the Home Charges.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: Well, I am sorry there is not the common ground between my friend and myself that I thought there was. I know of no case being made out in reference to the Home Charges. I do think there is a case with reference to the military expenditure. I was last year asked that there should be an inquiry as to that. My hon. friend the member for Banffshire asked for a committee of inquiry into the condition of the people of India, into the burdens of taxation, and into the question of general expenditure. I said last Session, in reply to the hon. member for the Forest of Dean, that the Government did not mean to have an inquiry by a committee of the House of Commons into the whole policy of the Indian Government. (Cheers.) That is impracticable, and it would be useless. The Imperial policy which one Cabinet after another may have pursued in India is a question which, if it be wrong, must be brought before Parliament and before this House. The Cabinet is responsible to Parliament and to the House of Commons, but for a Select Committee upstairs to inquire into the wisdom of the policy say of the annexation of

Burma, or into the question of the fortifications of the North-West frontier, or with reference to the delimitation of the boundaries between India and Afghanistan, all these are questions of imperial policy. They are not questions for a Select Committee. (Hear.) I do not want to deceive my hon. friend. I not only do not mean to ask the House to allow such an inquiry, but I will carefully, to the best of my ability, guard against the possibility of such an inquiry being granted. I say there is need for inquiry into the expenditure. (Cheers.) Some people think there is no ground of complaint, but when there is a general impression that the expenditure is extravagant it is unwise not to bring the question to the test of public criticism. Those who think that an unfair share of the Home Charges is thrown upon the Indian Exchequer should have the opportunity of having the matter threshed out before a Committee of both Houses, or by some other mode of inquiry competent to deal with the question. But after the experience we have had, and the utter breakdown of all these Committees on Indian affairs—Committees which have endeavoured to cover the whole range of Indian politics, I for one will be no party to asking this House to embark on any such fresh inquiry. The Government are anxious and desirous that there should be a fair, full, and complete inquiry in the direction I have indicated. We have not yet finally decided the mode in which the inquiry should proceed. My hon. friend the member for Banffshire last year proposed to me the appointment of a Royal Commission. I objected to it then as I thought it too cumbrous and expensive a mode of procedure. I preferred myself, and my Parliamentary instincts led me to prefer, a Parliamentary inquiry. (Hear.) But I am bound to say that very strong reasons have been urged on my notice since then why a Parliamentary inquiry would not, perhaps in the circumstances, be the best. A Parliamentary inquiry of necessity ceases when the existing Parliament ceases to exist, and it certainly would be impossible to get an inquiry—a satisfactory inquiry—brought to a conclusion in one Session of Parliament. Accidents sometimes happen to Parliaments: they do not necessarily last a certain number of Sessions: they may come to an end. Accidents, too, sometimes happen to right hon and hon. members of Parliament: they may not be members of the next Parliament, and hon. gentlemen interested in Indian affairs and very competent to express an opinion upon them, may not be members of the next Parliament. It has been urged upon me I ought to consider, before finally submitting the question to the House of Commons, whether it would not be desirable to have an impartial, small, but thoroughly efficient, Royal Commission, in order to inquire into the whole circumstances. That is a question on which I do not, at the present time, nor is it necessary I should, express any opinion. All I can say with reference to the amendment of my hon. friend as it stands is that it is an unconstitutional and incompetent amendment. The Queen cannot direct her Ministers to repeal an Act of Parliament. That must be done by Parliament and by no one else. With reference to the opinion he has expressed that a "fair and adequate" portion of the expenditure should be borne by the Home Exchequer, we are quite willing that such an inquiry should be held and we are content to abide by its result. I, therefore, hope that my hon. friend will not press this matter to a division, if he does I shall be compelled to vote against him, and I should be sorry in that way to cast some doubt on the desirability of this inquiry. Whatever may be our financial views, whatever may be the opinion of the House, and I am not going to touch on the question of the import duties on cotton, that I shall be prepared to discuss when the proper time comes, now is not the time for the question is not raised by this amendment. Whatever may be the opinion of the House as to whether our policy has been wise or unwise I claim for my colleagues not only in the Government but also those in the India Office and Indian Council, men of great experience and knowledge in Indian affairs, and in sympathy with the best administration of those affairs, an equal desire not to oppress India, not to bleed India, not to injure India, but to go on in that grand career of progress which has hitherto characterised the rule of India by Great Britain, in the belief that that rule has conferred upon the people of India an unspeakable boon while it has rebounded in no small degree to the glory and honour of the United Kingdom. (Loud Cheers.)

Sir D. MACFARLANE: I quite agree with my right hon. friend that the hon. member who moved this amendment has not made out a case for such an inquiry to the extent he has indicated. It would be strange indeed if the Government had not been guilty of some mistakes, but I venture to say that no case has been made out which justifies the terms used by my hon. friend. I have myself been for several years pressing for such an inquiry as the right hon. gentleman has expressed his willingness to grant, and by question as well as by notice of motion I have urged that there should be a Committee or a Commission to show to the people of India that which they do not know, and I am afraid do not believe, that we are treating them equitably and fairly in the matter of Home Charges. (Hear.) I am not going to make any charge against successive governments. But it is desirable that if the policy be just it should be made known to be so to the people of India, while if it be unjust then the people at home should be made acquainted with the fact. There is one point I should like to refer to, even though it be deemed to be a small matter, and that is the throwing upon the revenues of India a portion of the charges incurred on the Opium Commission. It is such small affairs as these which indicate the way the wind blows. The people of India did not ask for the Commission, it was obnoxious to most of them, and it was thrust upon them by a certain number of hon. gentlemen who were not aware what the consequences would be if they attempted to interfere with the habits of the natives, and who thought they could deal with Opium as with Local Veto. They were not aware that such interference might lead to grave disturbance if not to insurrection. I agree with the right hon. gentlemen in the tribute he has paid to the work done by the great civil and military services in India. Nothing can surpass the high character of these services. At the same time it may be said, and I think perhaps with some truth, that possibly in these times as good men could be secured for less remuneration. (Hear). There might be some trifling saving in that direction, but I am not sure it would be worthy consideration. If there is one thing desirable it is that every British official in India should be beyond reproach. There is always great difficulty experienced in checking the tyranny of the native police, and half the time of the district officers is taken up in trying to prevent these native officials from oppressing the Indians. We have to a large extent succeeded in our rule in India; we have saved the country from the continual wars and troubles which used to affect it, and it is as safe now for a poor man to walk about in any part as it is in England. That is a thing to be proud of, especially when we consider what India was until we made our appearance there. (Cheers). I do not deny that we ourselves have derived considerable advantages from our occupation of the country—(hear, hear)—but the advantage is not by any means all on one side. The natives may think that they pay too much, and if they have done so it should be paid back to them. (Hear). I do not agree with the views of my hon. friend as to the excessive nature of the general charges. The greatest blessing ever conferred on India was when Englishman landed there. (hear, hear) We adminster it to the best of our ability and with justice and fairness, and we have succeeded in a way no other country in the world ever succeeded. By all means let us have this Commission appointed, let us go into the question whether there is anything now charged on India which should be paid by the Imperial Exchequer, and if so let the change be made. We have no wish to be unjust in any way. It is the desire of every one of us to contribute as far as possible to the welfare of the people of India—(cheers)—and whatever is to their advantage will be equally to the advantage of the people of England. (Hear, hear.) No body of public men in the world ever administered a country with a more honest desire to benefit the people than the British civil and military services have done in India, and if my hon. friend gets the Commission he asks for, I hope he will succeed in all his legitimate desires. (Cheers.)

Mr. SEYMOUR KEAY: I do not want to detain the House at any length on this occasion, and I do not think I should have intervened in this debate at all had it not been that the figures quoted by the right hon. gentleman, the Secretary of State for India, made me see at once that he had made a great mistake. He spoke about the comparative insignificance of the number of European servants and the pecuniary amounts paid for the services rendered, and he seemed to me to state figures which ought to be multiplied three or four times over in order to get at the truth. I know how probably the mistake occurred, because none of these returns are ever summed up, and unless some one is employed on the labourious task of summing up the columns, it is easy to understand how a wrong result may be arrived at. With regard to the number of Europeans in India, it is only three years ago that a return was laid on the Table of this House on my motion by the Secretary of State for India, and there we have the whole thing in black and white. I will merely, therefore, in the briefest possible way, state the real figures of the number of Europeans and emoluments paid them. Reckoning those who have salaries of over £100 a year, or to speak more accurately, of 1,000 rupees a year, the return shows that instead of 7,000 Europeans as stated by the right hon. gentlemen, there are no less than 28,000, and the amount of money which these 28,000 Europeans receive, aggregates no less than 154 million rupees. The hon. member for Central Finsbury said he estimated the whole of the amount paid to Europeans in salaries at Rs. 200,000,000. I do not know if he was including the cost of the rank and file of the British army; but if that is the case certainly his figure is under the mark instead of over it. The return given on my motion only shows the salaries over 1,000 rupees a year, and the hon. gentleman says he has included those of 250 rupees instead of 1,000 rupees. There is no doubt the amount shown by my return, namely, Rs. 154,000,000 a year is decidedly under the mark. Then there is an additional fact which bears upon the motion before the House. Where are those Rs.154,000,000 received, and where are they expended? Of the Rs.154,000,000 the same return shows that no less than Rs.60,000,000 are remitted to be spent in England in the shape of pensions; that is to say that 40 per cent. of the whole of the amount disbursed in salaries of over 1,000 rupees a year to Europeans who have belonged to the Indian Service is remitted to and disbursed in England. Contrast that with what we find to be the case with regard to the natives. The natives are shown by the same return to be employed in their own country only to the number of 11,000 persons, that is to say in positions worth over 1,000 rupees a year. Amongst these 11,000 persons, who are the whole of the natives of India allowed to be employed in the service of their country at a salary of over 1,000 rupees, only a sum of Rs. 30,000,000 is divided. We therefore have this, that the payment to Europeans, retired and non-effective in this country, amounts to no less than double the entire amount disbursed to every native of India who is allowed to be employed in the service of his own country. I think, Sir, that the fact that such an enormous amount as Rs.60,000,000 a year is spent in England upon retired Europeans is of itself an argument which ought to convince us that there are very great and serious grounds for the amendment which has been brought before the House, namely that the English nation have benefitted pecuniarily as well as politically in an extraordinary degree by means of the system at present obtaining, and which is undoubtedly such a heavy and grievous cost on the revenues of India.

Mr. W. S. Caine: I should like to express my regret if I have unduly interrupted the Secretary of State with interjections, which I think were pertinent, and by which I thought I might be saved the making of a speech. I will only venture to say that if the Government really mean to grant a Committee—and the hon. gentleman's instincts in that direction are sound—it will scarcely be necessary to divide on the amendment. There is no doubt there does exist in the minds of the educated natives of India, as reflected not only by the National Congress, but, by the Press, a strong impression that this country does to some extent milk India by charging to her revenue much which ought by right to fall on our own exchequer. If it could be understood that the reference to the Committee could be so framed as to make it quite clear that the Committee was to investigate the relative proportion in which certain charges ought to be distributed, then this amendment might probably be withdrawn.

Mr. Fowler: That would be the meaning of the inquiry.

Mr. Caine: Then I am quite content. Last Session I called attention to the charge upon India for twelve years of £10,000 as a subsidy for the cable between Mauritius and the continent of Africa; and I was told that the justification for the charge was the strategic position of the Mauritius as regarded the defence of the Indian Empire. That is a charge which ought never to have been imposed on India at all, and it is but a single instance of charges that ought to be borne by this country, but which we cast upon India. As to the British army in India, we should withdraw a considerable portion of it without scruple if we wanted it and it is really in India for British purposes. The men serve in India for four years out of seven; and if India paid for taking them, Great Britain ought to pay for bringing them back again. I hope the Committee will be appointed soon, otherwise there will be disappointment in India as much evidence has been prepared for it.

Mr. Curzon: I am sure the House will have listened with respect and admiration to the straightforward and statesmanlike speech of the Secretary for India, and particularly to his broad general statement of the services Great Britain has rendered and is rendering to India, and of the spirit which animates us in our relations with India. The right hon. gentleman also made a clear statement as to the nature of the promised inquiry into the financial relations between Great Britain and India; and whether the inquiry is conducted by a Committee or a Commission, I believe it will have the co-operation and support of both sides of the House. I would like, if I may, to add one or two words to the dignified refutation the Secretary of State for India offered of some of the statements which occurred in the three speeches, notably in those of the mover and seconder of this amendment. I cannot help thinking from the speeches of the mover and seconder of the amendment, that they must be singularly oblivious of former debates in this House. Every argument they have used has been heard before, and those who recollect the Budget speech of the Secretary of State last summer will be aware how complete was the answer given to the statements that have now been repeated. Nevertheless, the same platitudes, the same worn-out, threadbare, and preposterous fallacies that were then brought out to be once more shattered, pulverised, and destroyed, have now come up to be again answered six months afterwards. I must say a word upon the concluding part of the amendment to the operation of which the Secretary of State did not find time to allude. The hon. member asked the House to say "that the British Treasury should sustain a fair and equitable portion of all expenditure incurred on all military and political operations beyond the boundaries of India in which both Indian and British interests are jointly concerned." This is a somewhat vague and indefinite proposition, but the hon. member explained that he would adopt the boundaries which existed when the Government of India was taken over by the Crown nearly 40 years ago. The hon. member did not lay stress upon the fact, but the wording of the amendment would bring political as well as military operations within the rule. Does the hon. member really know what were the boundaries in 1857? Has he any idea how the India of to-day differs from the India of 1857? Does he know the preposterous demand he is making upon intelligence and statesmanship? The amendment would apply to our operations in Beloochistan, which are now not military but political, and are concerned with the organisation of an administration. Is that to be met jointly by the Indian and the British Exchequer? The proposed rule would mean that the cost of the Waziri Expedition and the frontier demarcation now being conducted between India and Afghanistan should be borne by the two Exchequers as well as the campaigns on the North West frontier, which are provoked by turbulent frontier tribes and are repelled by local levies. Lastly, it would mean that the expense of the annexation of Upper Burma, authorised of course by this House, but in no sense an operation directly affecting British as distinct from Indian interests, should also have been divided between the two Exchequers. I hope the legitimate responsibility of England for military operations beyond the Indian frontier will never be ignored, and I can conceive of occasions of invasion when a demand might most properly be made upon this country for co-operation. But that the cost of these small frontier wars and expeditions, and the civil organization resulting from their successful issue, should be borne by us in common with India is an idea which will not commend itself to any but the hon. gentleman, and the section for whom he spoke. (Hear, hear). When the hon. member complained that the people of India had no voice in the expenditure of their country, he forgot that by the Legislative Councils Bill of the late Government, from the first time members of were given the right not only to ask questions but also to make statements and speeches upon the Budgets of the Councils. The hon. member must know that the government of India is conducted in as fierce a light as that of this country, and perhaps under a more concentrated blaze. The right to ask questions and to make speeches is a positive guarantee not merely that the views of those for whom the hon. member spoke will be represented, but that nothing in the nature of substantial injustice will be done. It would have been more to the point if the hon. member, instead of referring to military and political operations, had alluded to a certain Commission of inquiry ordered by this House, and the cost of which is to be thrown upon India. If he came forward with a proposition that we should bear half that expense I am sure he would meet with much support. I pass to the speech made by the seconder of the amendment. I confess Sir, I always listen with astonishment to the speeches of the hon. gentleman (Sir W. Wedderburn). The hon. baronet is a distinguished member of a body of civilians whose rule in India has been eulogised by more than one speaker, and of whom it might be justly said that they are the pride and glory of their country. Yet, coming back here with the traditions of the service upon him, with his great knowledge of Indian affairs, he loses no opportunity of traducing the body of which he was once a member, and slandering the great and splendid work it is carrying on.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN: I admit that the service is doing good work, but I contend that it is done on a scale too expensive for the country. I make no charge whatever against the great service to which I have had the honour to belong, but my wish is that the service should be servants of the people, and not their masters. I have no wish to "traduce" the service.

Mr. CURZON: I am glad to hear that repudiation, but the hon. baronet's speech undoubtedly supplied this foundation for his charge—that if the bulk of his accusations were true as to the poverty of the people of India and the oppression of the Government, it would constitute a grave charge against those responsible for the administration of the country. The hon. baronet complained that no reference was made in the Queen's Speech to matters connected with India. For my part, so far from deploring that India is not mentioned, I am glad that the condition of affairs in India is so satisfactory that there is no need to allude to it in the Queen's Speech. (Hear, hear.) The assumption underlying the speech of the hon. baronet was that the military expenditure of the Indian Government was unwise and unjustifiable and their policy rash and unsound. I have myself made in a humble way some attempt to understand the question—(hear, hear)—and I deliberately state that, broadly speaking, the frontier policy of India with the great expenditure it has entailed, has been not merely a wise and statesmanlike, but an absolutely necessary policy. No doubt great mistakes involving enormous financial responsibility have been committed. Nobody would now defend the fatal policy and ruinous cost entailed by the first Afghan War. But we have learnt by experience, and are, I should imagine, extremely unlikely to make any such blunder again. The policy of military expenditure, the frontier expeditions, and the cost of setting up an organised administration after victory has been won, constitute a policy of insurance which we are bound to pay for our great Empire. Our long immunity from war in India has been simply due to the effect of the millions of money we have been content to spend upon that object. The only way, in my judgment, by which we can escape the invasion of India is by rendering invasion sufficiently dangerous to make it not worth while for anyone to attempt it. (Hear, hear.) Seriously as I think this House should scrutinise the various acts of the Indian Government and their consequent financial responsibility, for my own part I am of opinion that the policy of Lord Lansdowne, Lord Roberts, and the great men who for the past 15 years have been making secure the frontiers of India is one that should meet with the gratitude of this country and the support of this House. (Cheers.)

Mr. WEBB: I wish to make a few observations on this occasion. I have lately been in India. I would desire very strongly to deprecate the temper of some of the remarks of the previous speakers, who spoke of the hon. baronet the member for Banff as traducing and slandering the Civil Service of India. I do not think the hon. baronet did anything of the kind; I have carefully watched his speeches on the subject of India, and I never heard anything of the sort. I should think it a great misfortune if any Civil Servants of the Crown are to be above criticism and we are to be accused of slandering and traducing them if we criticise them. I think it will be a great misfortune for the Civil Service and for the Empire at large if we forget that civil servants, no matter how able, are servants of the country. The previous speaker also referred to worn-out platitudes. I think there is a great deal in the past history of this country which should render us very careful about talking of reiterating platitudes, because very often we have had to learn that the reiterated platitudes of one generation are the policy of the next. I wish I could see my way as clearly as some do with reference to these questions connected with India. The question before us is surrounded with a great many difficulties, but we as Members of Parliament are compelled to face them and to do our best to understand them. It is no excuse that the task of governing India is such a difficult one because we must make up our minds when we hear arguments from one side and the other as to which are the best, and act accordingly. The question is, what are our responsibilities and how can we meet them best. One would suppose that the serious state of things in existence would be a reason for endeavouring to make them better and trying to do away with those wrongs which I believe exist under our present administration. If anything, I think what strikes a casual observer in India most is the extreme poverty of the mass of the people and the extent to which they are taxed. When I consider what wages are in England I wonder how wage-earners in India manage to live upon the low wages they obtain. I found that in a large State the wages of compositors were ninepence a week, and that you can have a man to pull a punkah for three annas a day, whilst four annas a day are required for the use of a dog or a horse. I know it is said that the Land Tax is not in any sense a tax upon the people in the sense of the proceeds coming into our Budget. In one sense that is true and in another sense it is not true, because when additional taxation is required in India efforts are made to screw up the Land Tax so as to make up the deficiency, and in that way I believe it comes to be a tax on the people. I believe the Land Tax in many places is being unfairly screwed up. The system there consists of taxing the land not in proportion to what it is producing at the time, but in proportion to what officials think it ought to produce. It is the same as if here a mountain farm in Ireland were taxed at the same rate as wheat land because it ought to be wheat land. The Secretary of State for India referred to the Salt Tax. That has been one of the matters with regard to which the strongest complaints have been made. Salt is so dear that people cannot get enough of it. The amount of salt per individual consumed in India is enormously less than that consumed per head in England. My firm conviction is that both policy and justice require that the people of this country should pay a larger proportion of Indian military expenditure than at present. I believe it would be a good policy, because it would redound largely to our honour and to the satisfaction of the people of India, and at the same time the expense of these frontier wars would be diminished, because we should look into them more carefully. For that reason, if for no other, I do think we ought to be prepared to pay a large portion of this expenditure. I believe it would redound largely to the peace and contentment of India if we did pay a large portion. I would strongly deprecate the feeling of too much satisfaction with regard to our rule of India. It is a great charge and a great responsibility, and I do not think that we ought to be too self-complacent. The Secretary for India says the Government of that country had been good in the past, is good in the present, and would be good in the future. I do not at all say that. Good intentions and honest desire to do right are by no means a criterion that good has been done. I know in my own country that for generation after generation there has been every desire to do right, but because rulers were not acting in accordance with the wishes of the people they made the most dreadful mistakes. I am a supporter of the present Government, but I do regret the temper which the Secretary of State for India has sometimes shown in treating this question. I think when we have only one representative of India that a deeper sympathy should be shown him than that there should be so much readiness to take up his words. Without going further into the question I believe that it is essential for the good government of India that, no matter how well-intentioned our Secretaries are, in some way they should take advantage more than they do at present to find out the wishes and desires of the Indian people themselves. Until that is done we can never be on safe ground and we can never be sure, however good our intentions are, that we are not running any risks. With these few remarks I desire to support the motion.

Sir RICHARD TEMPLE: I am very unwilling to make any remarks, but there is just one thing which seems to me ought to be said. From the remarks of some hon. members opposite it might be supposed that our military expenditure is too high—in other words that our fighting strength in India is too high. I do not suppose it will be thought that military expenditure can be lowered unless the fighting power is lowered also. That cannot be said of all countries as it can be said of India, and I would like this House to consider whether the fighting expenditure of India is more than we want or not; or whether it is as much as we want. I do earnestly advise any hon. member who wishes to understand the fundamental essentials of the military problem, to carefully peruse a work published about two years ago upon "Russia in Central Asia." From that work any hon. member can obtain one of the very best statements I have ever read on the subject. It shows how Russia had advanced to the very gates of Afghanistan, and then it indicates the tremendous torrent, which, upon a declaration of war, Russia could pour like a stream of lava towards India through Afghanistan. The book goes on to consider what reply England could make, and I hope the muster roll it gives and the gathering of the forces which it represents on the side of India would be enough—I hope that in Providence it may be enough. With that, if I had the command, I should hope to check Russia, but it would require all I knew and all my officers knew to do it. And then, look at the awful issues which depend on it, with enough and barely enough to meet them. If we have only enough upon what possible ground can it be argued that the military expenditure can be reduced? I have no doubt the House will consider the statements made by my hon. friend the member for Oxford, who says it is as much as we can do to put 40,000 men—he says 30,000—into line to meet any enemy. I repeat in case of war our force is barely enough, and that any Englishman who considers the relative muster of the forces of the two Empires, I won't say will tremble at the result, but he will pray that the heart of our brave soldiers may be steeled at that moment. These are tremendous issues, and such grave matters ought not to be trifled with, not as they sometimes have been, but as they always are trifled with, both by the mover and seconder of the Amendment. As I say these are tremendous issues; and let me tell the hon. member, who moved the Amendment, with all respect, that it is England who would suffer far more than India if things were to go wrong with British arms in India. I say that all the frontier defences of India are wanted for India itself, and not at all for England. What does the hon. member the mover of the Amendment suppose that England would care for a strip of desert to the East of Merv or a tract of land among the Rocky Slopes of Afghanistan if it were not for India? Of course it is for India and for India alone, and you cannot differentiate between the expenditure on the frontiers and the general expenditure of India because they are all one and the same concern. With regard to Burma what ground have the mover and seconder of the Amendment for asking that the expenses for annexing Upper Burma should be borne by England. Burma is an integral part of the British Empire, and for whose sake was it annexed? Why of course for the sake of India. What do we care for the upper regions of the Burmese rivers except for the same reason. By these transactions we endangered our relations with France, and for whose sake was all this risk undertaken? Of course for the sake of India. It may be remembered that the mover of this Amendment comes from one of the most loyal sections of the British Indian Provinces. I highly respect the noble clan from which the hon. member comes, and I quite admit that it does contain some of the bluest blood among all the nationalities of the earth, but I must say that coming from such a clan, of such a very high reputation, speaking in such high terms as the hon. member did of the benefits of the British rule in India, I am astonished at him bringing forward such an Amendment of this kind. If he will allow me to say so, I do not think the speeches he makes in this House could be made with safety in Bombay. His brother clansmen would be astounded at such utterances.

Mr. Naoroji: I have said the same things there very often.

Sir R. Temple: This amendment is not seriously regarded by any section of Englishmen, Scotchmen, or Irishmen in this House, except perhaps by the seconder of the amendment and possibly by the last speaker. Does the hon. member for Finsbury suppose if he were to tell the British electorate that India was putting a burden upon our budget, that it would not be very awkward to set up hostile influences against India, and not only that, but between those who were interested in trade with India and those who were not? Really these things are so tolerated by the kind patience of the House that it is time someone should stand up and expose in their true light the sentiments which have been expressed. I am astonished that the hon. member should make such a proposition as is contained in his amendment and could suppose that it could be seriously regarded either by a British House of Commons or by a British electorate. It is no use my going over and over again these questions, which, as has been said, have been pulverised Session after Session. They crop up again just as though they had never been before us. We are again to be told that the people of India are dying of starvation, the very people who are increasing and multiplying more than any nation under heaven. We are again to be told that they are half starved when they are sending 120 millions worth of produce annually to foreign countries, and when they are flooding the British corn markets with grain to the dismay of the English farmer. We are told that their resources are decreasing when their trade is expanding, when their agriculture is spreading fast, and when capital is shown to be growing and accumulating. What my hon. friend who has just sat down urged as an argument was that the wages are very low; but then the prices are very low also. These misrepresentations have been constantly exposed. As one who has served the municipality of London in one of the poorest parts of the metropolis, I ought to know something of the misery and distress which prevails here, and nation for nation and country for country, I declare that there is far less misery in India than there is in this country, and that the actual want and necessity is greater and more perceptible here than in India. I utterly and entirely disagree with all the hon. member's statements about the growing poverty in India. I think the very opposite is the case; and, as for benefits, why, compare the benefits that England derives from India with what India derives from us. We owe, undoubtedly, a great deal of our commerce to India, but what does India owe to us? The people of India owe their lives to us, their homes, their hearths, their freedom, their rights, their liberty and in fact everything. It does astonish me when I consider the way my countrymen have given their lives to the service of India, to see such very scant gratitude shown them by the hon. member for the Central Division of Finsbury. Let me add my testimony to that which I am sure will be borne by every member on this side of the House who has served in India and is acquainted with Indian affairs, to the remarkable skill, ability and patriotic spirit with which the right hon. gentleman, the Secretary for India, has defended the interests of India. I congratulate him on the way he has mastered the Indian problems, and the statesman-like way in which he has dealt with the whole subject.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member propose to withdraw his Amendment?

Mr. Naoroji: May I ask if the right hon. gentleman the Secretary of State for India adheres to his pronouncement in regard to the Committee of Investigation?

Mr. H. H. Fowler assented.

Mr. Naoroji: I very much regret the decision.

The Amendment was then by leave withdrawn.

February 14*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WASTE LAND GRANTS IN BURMA.

On the motion of Mr. Alpheus Morton there was granted a Return of the number of Waste Land Grants in Burma exceeding 1,000 acres since the 1st day of January, 1870: the names of the original grantees; date of grant; conditions of grant: whether conditions fulfilled; number resumed for non-fulfilment of conditions: dates and particulars of resumption; date and particulars of any assignments of the original grant; names of present proprietors; and copy of all rules at present in force relating to such Waste Land Grants.

COOLIE RECRUITING IN BENGAL.

Mr. Schwann asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to the remarks concerning the recruiting of coolies in Bengal made by Mr. Toynbee, Commissioner of Bhagalpur Division, and published in the *Calcutta Gazette* of the 3rd October last, in which he gave many instances of criminal complaints, made in the Damka district, with reference to coolie recruiting, and also of cases of abduction of women and children for a similar purpose in in Deoghur, and of the forcible carrying off of youths in Godda district:

And, whether, in view of the constant and apparently unavoidable abuses to which the present system of recruiting coolies for the tea plantations of Assam, etc., gives rise, he would consult the Government of India with the view of gradually abrogating these special laws, and leave tea planters in India to obtain coolies like other employers of labour in the open market and under ordinary conditions.

Mr. H. H. **FOWLER**: I have seen the remarks to which my hon. friend refers, and I find that they have also received the attention of the local authorities. I know that the Government of India are most anxious to gradually abrogate the special law for Assam, and that their recent amendments of the Act were framed with a view to pave the way for a system of absolutely free migration. I will, however, again call their attention to this subject.

FLOGGING IN THE INDIAN ARMY.

Mr. **HANBURY** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would lay upon the Table any communications that had passed between him and the Government of India, in consequence of his promise given on 16th April last year, on the subject of flogging in the Indian army:

And, what steps, if any, had been taken to abolish flogging in the Indian Army, and thus remove the existing distinction in respect of liability to flogging between the natives of India and all other of Her Majesty's soldiers, including the West India regiments.

Mr. H. H. **FOWLER**: I addressed a despatch on this subject to the Government of India in May last, in fulfilment of my promise to which the honourable member alludes. The question has been under consideration since then, and I believe that a despatch from the Government of India will probably arrive by next mail.

February 15th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Mr. **SINCLAIR**: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India a question of which I have given him private notice. I wish to know whether it is the case that he has consented to receive a deputation of Scotch manufacturers whose interests are said to be affected injuriously by the recently imposed Indian import duties upon cotton:

And, whether it is the intention of the Government to take the necessary steps for depriving the imposition of the duties of all protective character.

Mr. **FOWLER**: It is the case that I have made an appointment to receive a deputation of Scotch manufacturers with reference to the recently imposed Indian import duties upon cotton.

With reference to the second question, I can only say that in my despatch to the Governmant of India on December 13th last, I stated that Her Majesty's Government are precluded by their pledges from sanctioning the imposition of import duties upon cotton goods unless under such conditions as will ensure beyond question that the duties thus proposed will have no protective effect. I need hardly say that to that declaration I unreservedly adhere.

Mr. **TOMLINSON**: Will the right hon. gentleman give the same attention to the representations which have been made by the Lancashire cotton spinners and others employed in the cotton trade?

Mr. **FOWLER**: I do not quite understand the hon. gentleman. Is he asking me to receive a deputation from the Lancashire spinners?

Mr. **TOMLINSON**: Yes.

Mr. **FOWLER**: Oh, yes, with the greatest pleasure.

February 19th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE REPORT OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

Viscount **CROSS** called attention to the delay in presenting the report of the Opium Commission of which he had given notice on the 7th inst. He said, I beg to remind your lordships that so far back as 1893, a Commission was issued to inquire into the whole question of the opium trade, the revenue received in respect of it, and the monopoly of the Indian Government in connection with that commodity. That Commission, as your lordships are aware, was issued after a vote had been passed in the other House of Parliament. The question is one which affects most seriously the whole of India, whether it is viewed from a financial or from a moral or social standpoint; and it is, therefore, a subject in which everybody who is concerned in the welfare of India must feel the deepest possible interest. A long time has now elapsed since the appointment of that Commission. The Commissioners have taken voluminous evidence in India, and last Session everyone was very anxious that the report should be published before its close. In August last the delay in presenting the report was referred to in both Houses of Parliament, and the opinion was then confidently expressed that the report would be issued in November. Since then, my lords, three months have elapsed, but the report has not yet been issued. The Chairman of that Commission (Lord Brassey) has, we have heard, accepted an appointment in one of the colonies (Australia); and I congratulate the colony upon that appointment—(hear, hear)—as well as the noble lord himself. But it is partly on account of the fact that the noble lord will at no distant date be leaving England that I am anxious that the report should be issued so that we may have the benefit of the noble lord's advice and opinions before he undertakes the new duties which no doubt will engross his attention. In the other House of Parliament last Session, it was stated that the Indian revenues were to bear one-half of the charges incident to the inquiry; but this seems to me to be a monstrous burden to throw upon the revenues of India. I had intended to have asked a question to-night on that point, but understanding that it is the wish of the Secretary of State for India that I should not do so now, I will postpone that question for a short time.

Lord **REAY**: In reply to the noble Viscount, your lordships will probably agree with me, that considering all the circumstances, the extent of the inquiry, the fact that it had to be conducted in India, and that all the members of the Commission were not in this country during the later stages of the work, the time taken by the Commission before issuing the Report is not to be considered excessive. Certainly it is not excessive when compared with the time taken by the Commission on vaccination to which reference was made yesterday in your lordship's House. I am, however, I believe, in a position to assure the noble Viscount that the Report of the Opium Commission will very soon be laid on the Table of the House. The position of affairs is, that the English members have passed the Report with the exception of a summary of conclusions to be put forward at the next meeting by my noble friend the Chairman (Lord Brassey) who, I may say, both in India and in England, has used his influence to expedite the issue of the Report. (Hear, hear.) To-morrow and Thursday next the Commission will meet for the final verbal amendment, and the re-arrangement in some cases of the three or four sections passed last week, and for the consideration of a valuable memorandum on the original draft contributed by Mr. Haridas Veharidas, one of the Indian members, which was received only yesterday morning. The greater part of the Report which has been passed was sent to the Indian members a fortnight ago, and the remainder will go by the next mail. If they agree to the whole they have been requested to telegraph their assent and to send memoranda with the particulars respecting which they wish to qualify the views and conclusions of their colleagues. Mr. Haridas's memorandum has already in a great measure been anticipated during the recent sittings, but no communication has been received from the Mahárája of Dharbhanga. In the event of the receipt of a memorandum from the Mahárája qualifying his acceptance of the Report, the Commission will meet once more to consider his suggestions before ordering the Report to be submitted. I think, however, I may safely say that the Report will be issued before Easter. (Hear, hear).

The Marquis of **LANSDOWNE**: I have no doubt that most of your lordships will share the feeling of the noble Viscount (Cross) that it is unfortunate so long a time should have intervened between the taking of the evidence in India and the final expression of the views of the Commissioners, and I hope that the Chairman of the Commission will concur in my opinion that whatever may have been the cause of the delay the Government of India cannot be charged with any responsibility for it. (Hear, hear). I am glad to have this opportunity of bearing witness to the earnestness shown by the officials of the Indian Government throughout the country in facilitating the work of the Commission. The Under Secretary for India (Lord Reay) was perfectly right when he said that in this case there were special circumstances making some delay inevitable. I suppose this is a solitary instance of a Royal Commission having some members domiciled in this country and others living in different parts of India. Those of your lordships who know by experience how difficult is the task of reconciling opposing views on Commissions and Committees can picture to yourselves the embarrassments which must have been occasioned to the members of this Commission when the time came for an interchange of views between the London and the Indian sections. There is another point also which ought to be taken into consideration, namely, that the Commissioners were apparently obliged to compress within the limits of a single cold season an extremely difficult and detailed inquiry. The result was that the evidence had to be taken rather hurriedly. The Commissioners were obliged occasionally to divide into sections, and witnesses had to be summoned from different parts of the country. It gives me, my lords, great satisfaction to learn that the Report may be expected at a very early date. It is, I can assure your lordships awaited with the utmost interest in India, because this is a subject concerning not only the finances of India, but the private lives and the domestic habits of the people of that country. (Hear, hear). With reference to the subject of expense of the Commission which the noble Viscount has postponed, I may say that the general feeling in India among natives and Europeans—officials and unofficials—can I believe be expressed in the following words: "We did not want this inquiry, and if you wanted it you ought to pay for it yourselves." That is the view entertained from one end of the country to the other. (Hear, hear). I will not now press the question further, but I will ask my noble friend (Lord Reay) to consider whether this is not a case in which the costs of the trial might fairly follow the verdict? If the Comissioners should report that the abuse of the opium drug is very much less than has been supposed; should they report that the people of India are not nearly so chargeable with intemperance in the matter of stimulants: should they report that the growth and cultivation of opium in India does not affect the consumption of opium in China much more than the growth of a choice Bordeaux vintage affects intemperance in the United Kingdom; should they report that the Government of India from time to time has done its best to check the immoderate use of the drug and to prevent any artificial stimulus being given to its use; should they report that any further interference with the use of opium might raise, not only financial, but social and political questions of the gravest importance:—(hear, hear)—should they report in this way and to this effect, then I venture to say that Lord Elgin's Government will be amply justified if they say to Her Majesty's Government: "This inquiry was forced upon us under pressure from an influential section in your political community at home, you have failed to prove your case against us; you have unsettled the minds of the people of this country; pray do not, inflict upon us the further injustice of making us pay for an investigation which we regard both as mischievous and superfluous." (Hear, hear).

Lord **Brassey**: I will not detain your lordships more than a few moments whilst I explain how it was practically impossible for the Commission to present their report in time for consideration in the last Session of Parliament. After having taken evidence in London in September the Commissioners met for the taking of evidence in Calcutta on November 18th, 1893. Between November 18th, 1893, and the departure of the Commission from India on its return to this country, with the exception of some few days at Christmas, the Commission sat every working day often six and seven hours a day, and sometimes two sections sat on the same day. The result of that constant sitting was that the printers could not possibly keep pace with the Commission. I desire to say that at Calcutta the work of the Government printing press was admirably done: but of course when the Commission were at a distance from Calcutta, in the Punjab or in Burma, it was impossible that the Government printers should keep up with the work in a satisfactory manner. It was, therefore, decided to bring the shorthand writers' notes to England, and to print them here. The printing of the evidence taken in India and in Burma was not completed until the end of June. Then it was found necessary to issue interrogatories through the Foreign Office to the Consuls in China and to other persons whose information they were desirous of obtaining with reference to the opium question in China. The replies from China were not printed and in the hands of members till July. It was, therefore, quite impossible for presentation to this and the other House in the last Session of Parliament. They could have presented a short report by meeting in Bombay at the conclusion of their journey through India. They did hold consultations in Bombay, and did decide on resolutions which practically formed the recommendations of the Commission; but it would have been most unsatisfactory to have presented a final report in Bombay without an opportunity of considering the evidence which they had much trouble to take, and which involved considerable expenditure of public money. The report was ready for consideration in the early part of November of last year, and I can truly say that from that time to the present the attention of the Commission has been bestowed with the utmost assiduity upon the subject, which is by no means a simple one. I can only say that the pledge given by Mr. Fowler in the other House of Parliament to the effect that the report will be in the hands of Parliament before Easter will be faithfully kept. (Hear, hear.)

Viscount **Cross**: I wish to thank the noble lord (Brassey) for the immense trouble he has taken as chairman of the Commission; and I have only to add that I am happy to hear that the report will be presented before Easter, because it is so anxiously looked forward to.

The subject then dropped.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRONTIER EXPENDITURE.

On the motion of Sir **William Wedderburn** it was decided to present an address for a Return prepared for the right hon. member for South Aberdeen, showing expenditure incurred out of the revenues of India on the construction of railways and roads, and on military expeditions and explorations and subsidies to native chiefs beyond the West and North-West Frontier of India, from April, 1882, to March, 1891.

THE BOMBAY CIVIL FUND.

Sir **Seymour King** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been called to the fact that, under the existing rules of the Bombay Civil Fund, while the widow of a deceased subscriber received £400 a-year, and each daughter £100, and any daughter who came on the fund after 1865 received a further bonus of £1,000 on marriage, no provision was made to give any extra benefit to daughters who, coming on the fund in middle life, at forty years or over, had practically no expectations of marriage:

Whether a memorial had been submitted to him by a lady, who stated that her father died in 1890, at the age of 85, having paid subscriptions to the fund for 63 years, and his wife having predeceased him, left four daughters on the fund whose ages ranged from 62 to 45, whose prospective chances of obtaining £1,000 by marriage she stated to be nil, and complaining that, although her father had made exceptional sacrifices to the fund, these daughters were excluded from a part of its benefits:

And, whether, as under sections 2 and 4 of The Bombay Civil Fund Act, 1882, discretion was given to the Secretary of State to give additional benefits if he should deem it reasonable he would exercise the discretion by arranging that a lady pensioner coming on the fund after a certain age might, by abandoning her claim to £1,000 on marriage, receive compensation in the shape of interest on that sum to be added to her pension of £100 per annum?

Mr. H. H. **Fowler**: The facts are as given in the hon. member's first and second questions—but he is mistaken if he supposes (as he apparently does) that the pension of £100 to a married daughter continues after marriage—the donation of £1,000 is contingent on marriage and the pension then ceases. An unmarried daughter has her pension during her life. As regards the third question, it was proposed to the subscribers of the fund, before the passing of the Act of 1882, that the donations to sons on attaining majority and to daughters on marriage should be somewhat diminished, in order that children's pensions, (including, of course, those of unmarried daughters) might be increased; but the members of the fund declined to accept this suggestion, and it is not intended to propose any variation of the settlement which was then made and was distinctly accepted as final.

INDIAN RAILWAYS.

Mr. R. G. **Webster** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that in the Administration Report on the Railways of India for 1893-4 there was a schedule of railways lately surveyed, at present under survey, or recently put forward for consideration, in all amounting to a mileage of 6,167:

Whether, during the next three years, he had authorised the construction of 2,000 miles:

And, whether, in view of the serious depression in the iron, coal, and other industries, and the lack of employment in this Country, and the large amount of unemployed capital, the Government proposed to authorise the whole of the above mileage to be immediately constructed.

Mr. H. H. **Fowler**: My answer to the hon. member's first question is in the affirmative. The total mileage now under construction or sanctioned is about 2,600, of which about a 1,000 miles are included in the schedule to which the hon. member refers. It is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to proceed with the construction of railways in India as rapidly as the resources of the Government of India will permit, and at the same time to make use of private agencies for that purpose whenever suitable terms can be arranged.

Mr. **Webster**: I should like to ask whether the Government cannot see their way to give an imperial guarantee for the construction of railways in India, as they did some years ago for the same purpose?

Mr. **Fowler**: The Government do not see their way to taking that course.

ALLIANCES WITH BURMESE WOMEN.

Mr. **Caine** asked the Secretary of State for India if his attention had been called to an official Circular recently addressed by the Chief Commissioner of Burma to the members of the Civil Service throughout the province, remonstrating with them with regard to the practice which had become prevalent of contracting illicit alliances with Burmese women, and speaking of it as a public scandal:

And, if he was able to lay a copy of the Circular upon the Table of the House.

Mr. H. H. **Fowler**: I have heard nothing of any Circular on the subject to which my hon. friend's question refers; but, since that question was put down, my attention has been called to a newspaper report of a speech by the Chief Commissioner, with the purport of which, as there reported, I entirely agree. From this speech it would appear that he has "semi-officially" and confidentially addressed some of his officers on the subject. If it is true that such a document was issued, and that it was confidential and not official, it is not likely that it will be published either in India or in this country.

SURGEON-MAJOR SMITH.

Mr. **Caine** asked the Secretary of State for India if he was aware that Surgeon-Major F. Clarence Smith had been dismissed by his Excellency the Governor of Madras upon certain written charges brought against him by Mr. Robert Clegg, a member of the Indian Civil Service, stationed at Combaconum; that Surgeon-Major Smith had been refused a copy of the written charges against him on which the Governor had taken action; and that, in a memorial submitted to the Madras Government by Surgeon-Major Smith, he complained that he had been condemned unheard, and without any knowledge of what the charges were upon which he had been dismissed:

If the matter had been referred home to the Secretary of State; and, if so, what had been the result:

And, if he would lay upon the Table of the House copies of all correspondence between Surgeon-Major Smith and the Government of Madras, and between them and the India Office.

Mr. H. H. **Fowler**: On the 18th January Surgeon-Major Smith sent to the Government of Madras a memorial to the Secretary of State appealing against the decision of the Madras Government in his case. The Government of Madras forwarded that memorial by the mail which arrived yesterday. The matter is therefore *sub judice*, and I do not think that it would be expedient for me to make any statement.

THE CASE OF MR. ARTHUR ROGERS.

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could now state what answer had been given by the Government of India to the memorial of Sir W. Hudson, President of the Behar Planters' Association, dated 28th January, 1894, on the subject of the slaughter of kine in India:

Whether Mr. Arthur Rogers's scheme, recommended in that memorial, for restoring friendly relations between the Muhammadans and Hindus had been considered by the Government of India and reported on as requested by the Secretary of State in his despatch of 31st May, last;

Whether the Viceroy in Council had approved of Mr. Rogers's scheme, and it had been partially introduced by two Local Governments:

Whether he was aware that Mr. Rogers had been dismissed from his appointment as an engineer on the Bengal and North Western Railway:

And whether he would explain the reasons for Mr. Rogers's dismissal, and would lay upon the Table of the House a memorial from Mr. Rogers in which he sets forth the facts of his case and prays for inquiry and redress.

Mr. H. H. **Fowler**: A question similar to that of my hon. friend was put in the Legislative Council of the Viceroy on the 25th January last. Sir Antony MacDonnell, the Member of Council in charge of the Home Department, stated in reply that Mr. Rogers's scheme, though not brought before the Government in the regular way, had been brought under their notice unofficially; and that the Government of India had made no use of Mr. Rogers's remedy, and that it appeared to them to contain no proposals of a practical character which the Government of India had not adopted independently of it. I believe that Mr. Rogers was for about four years in the service of the Bengal North-Western Railway Company as an assistant Engineer and that his services have been dispensed with by that Company. In consequence of an allegation by Mr. Rogers that he had been dismissed from the service of the Railway Company through pressure alleged to have been exercised upon them by the Governments of Bengal and the North-West Provinces and Oudh, I am informed by the Government of India that, as far as they are aware, the Board of the Bengal and North-Western Railway Company has dispensed with Mr. Rogers's services for its own reasons, and that no pressure was brought upon it either by the Government at Bengal, or that of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, or by the Government of India in the matter. I observe that Sir Antony Macdonell made a statement in the Legislative Council to the same effect.

PARLIAMENT AND ANGLO-INDIAN OFFICIALS.

Mr. **Henniker Heaton** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been directed to the statement of His Excellency the Viceroy of India, in the debate in Council on the Indian Tariff Bill, as published at page 53 of the Indian Tariff Act Blue Book, that members of the Indian Legislative Council were only free to speak and vote in the Council for the measure they honestly thought best, when that was in accordance with the "mandate" they had received from London:

Whether he was aware that the Right Hon. Sir Barnes Peacock and other authorities on Indian constitutional law had denounced that doctrine as an infringement of the rights and privileges of the Council:

And, whether, seeing that the Secretary of State for India, in a despatch dated 15th October, 1874, distinctly stated that the object of the instructions given to the Government of India on this subject was not to fetter the discretion which the law had vested in the various legislative authorities of India, the doctrine now laid down by the Viceroy of India was sanctioned by Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. H. H. **Fowler**: The question of the hon. member raises the important and delicate subject of the relations between the Government of India on the one hand and the Home Government and Parliament on the other. It is impossible within the limits of an answer to deal in a satisfactory manner with this matter: I will therefore merely say that at the proper time I shall be prepared to maintain that the course which has been taken by Her Majesty's Government and by the Viceroy upon recent occasions is in strict accordance both with the Acts of Parliament regulating the Government of India and with the constitutional and uniform practice under those Acts. In order that the leading precedents may be known to the House, I propose to lay upon the Table the relevant portions of a Despatch of the Duke of Argyll, dated the 24th November, 1870, and three despatches of Lord Salisbury, dated respective- 31st March, 1874, 15th October, 1874, and 31st May, 1876, in which the relative position of the Secretary of State and the Government of India were clearly laid down.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Sir Henry James asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had received a copy of the memorial of the Bombay Millowners presented to the Council of the Governor-General of India, mentioned at page 24 of the Papers relating to the India Tariff Act; or of the letter of the Secretary to the Millowners' Association of Bombay, dated 19th September, 1894, mentioned at page 27; of the memorial and telegrams from the Bombay Millowners' Association, mentioned at page 30:

And, if he was in possession of copies of such documents, whether he had any objection to making them public.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The reference cited in the first and second clauses of my hon. friend's question appear to refer to the same representation from the Bombay Millowners' Association. I also have seen the telegram dated the 19th Dec., cited in the third clause. There is no objection to laying those papers on the Table if they are desired.

SIR JAMES WESTLAND'S DESPATCH.

Mr. Maden asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would place upon the Table copies of the memorials sent with Sir James Westland's despatch of 21st March, 1894.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I have no objection to placing on the Table copies of papers received with the Government of India despatch of the 21st March, 1894.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Mr. Maden asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to a telegram from the *Times* correspondent at Calcutta, in which he said that it appeared that all the mills in India except one had ceased manufacturing counts above 20s;

And whether, under these circumstances, he still expected to collect any appreciable amount as excise duties.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I have seen the telegram, which apparently refers to the Calcutta mills out-put only. I have no official information on the subject.

February 21st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MILITARY EXPENDITURE.

Mr. Caine asked the Secretary of State for India what total expenditure had been incurred in the military, political, and transport operations carried on during the last three years beyond the northern frontiers of India, at Gilgit, Hunza, Chitral, and Chilas, and what portion, if any, had been borne by Kashmir;

And, would any Papers be laid presently upon the Table of the House bearing on the recently reported disturbances in the Hindu Kush?

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I can give the House a return of the expenditure incurred on these frontiers up to the end of 1892-93; but for figures of a later date and for the expenditure incurred by the Kashmir State I should have to ask the Government of India.

If the hon. member alludes to the disturbances in Chitral, the information at my disposal is not sufficiently complete to enable me to lay papers yet before the House.

PUNITIVE POLICE AT BALLADHUN.

Mr. Caine asked the Secretary of State for India, if the punitive police force was still quartered on the village of Balladhun.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The punitive police force quartered on the villages in the Cachar district, of which Balladhun is one, was sanctioned for one year only which ended on the 30th June, 1894. On the 4th June the Chief Commissioner declined to sanctian its retention for a further period. It may therefore be assumed that the force has been withdrawn.

THE INDIA COUNCIL.

Mr. Naoroji asked the Secretary of State for India, whether Sir Robert H. Davies's term of office as Member of the Council of India expired on the 3rd of March next:

Whether it was proposed to allow the vacancy to lapse in accordance with the terms of the Council of India Reduction Act of 1889, which provided that the Secretary of State might, if and whenever he thought fit, permit the Council to be reduced to ten Members by absorbing vacancies as they occurred.

And whether the Council at present consisted of twelve Members.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: Under the Act to which my hon. friend refers the Council of India has been reduced from fifteen to twelve members. I do not think that it would be to the public advantage to make any further reduction at present.

THE NIZAM OF HAIDARABAD.

Mr. Seymour Keay asked the Secretary of State for India whether there was any foundation for the statement that His Highness the Nizam of Haidarabad was being pressed to assign to the British Government the surplus revenues of his Berar provinces, or to assign fresh districts for the support of the Imperial defence troops.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The statement, so far as I am aware, is without foundation.

STEEL FOR INDIAN RAILWAYS.

Sir Alfred Hickman asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that the tests, requirements, and stipulations for steel for the Indian State Railways were such as are imposed by no other railways in the world:

Whether he was aware that such stipulations added materially to the price paid, and compelled the use of foreign ores and materials instead of those produced in this country.

And, whether he would consider the advisability of relaxing these tests, so as to allow of the use on the Indian Railways of British materials.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: My answer to the first two clauses of the hon. member's question is in the negative. As regards the alleged exclusion of British ores and materials, I am advised that the exclusion of basic steel, is confined to the case of axles, tyres, and locomotives generally: that the best class of this basic steel is accepted with certain exceptions, for girders; and that the commoner class is freely accepted when offered for rails and sleepers, which form the bulk of the steel sent to India.

In view of the great importance of securing the best qualities of material, I am advised that it would be undesirable to propose any relaxation of the existing tests.

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

MOTION FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

A CONSERVATIVE MANŒUVRE DEFEATED.

Sir Henry James, loudly cheered by the Conservative and the Liberal Unionist members and by several Liberal members representing Lancashire constituencies, said: I desire to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to a matter of definite and urgent public importance—the effect of the imposition of duties on cotton goods imported into India.

Sir D. Macfarlane: I wish, Mr. Speaker, before the question that leave be given is put, to ask for your ruling on a point of order, namely: Whether this motion is one contemplated by the Standing Order which permits motions for the adjournment of the House on matters of urgent public importance. This question might have been discussed on the Address a week ago, and it is no more urgent now than it was then. (Opposition cries of "Closure.") I wish to ask you, Sir, whether you did not give this ruling on the 13th of April, 1894, with reference to a motion of this kind: "I do not think that under the Standing Order of 1882 a motion on a subject of this kind, having such a very wide scope, was ever contemplated. What I think was contemplated was the occurrence of some sudden emergency—(Opposition cheers and counter cheers)—either in home or foreign affairs, but I do not think it was contemplated, if the House will allow me to state my view, that a question of very wide scope which would demand legislation to deal with it in an effective manner should be the subject of a discussion on a motion for adjournment of the House, because if that was so we might have repeated motions made by the Opposition of the day, not so much in the direction of censuring the Government for action which had been taken or not taken, but for bringing under public notice some grievance demanding instant remedy as in the direction of wishing to introduce legislation on some particular subject." I wish to ask you, Sir, if your ruling on that occasion will not apply to the present motion. (Hear, hear.)

The SPEAKER: I think it is entirely inapplicable to the case, and that the right hon. gentleman is in order in bringing the motion forward, as it relates to a particular subject. (Opposition cheers.) I understand this is an alleged grievance requiring instant remedy.

Sir D. MACFARLANE: Oh! (Cries of "Order.")

The SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. member asked for my ruling, and I expect that he will listen to me patiently. (Opposition cheers.)

Sir D. MACFARLANE: I beg pardon, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The last words which the hon. gentleman has quoted bring the motion definitely within the rule on the point of order, namely, "action which has been taken or not taken for bringing under notice some grievance demanding instant remedy." The reason why I objected to the motion to which the hon. gentleman has referred was that it was of such a very vague character and very wide scope that it could not be held to affect a particular interest. Here, it is alleged, the imposition of these duties affects a particular interest. I have very seldom interfered—I think only once—in motions of adjournment. This is a matter alleged to be of urgent public importance. I cannot deny that it is of public importance, and seeing that the duties have been recently imposed I cannot deny that it is of recent occurrence. On all these grounds I must say that the right hon. gentleman is in order so far as I am concerned. I cannot interfere on the point of order to prevent him from submitting his motion to the House, of which it alone must be the judge. (Cheers.) Is it your pleasure that the motion be allowed?

Most of the Conservative and Dissentient Liberals, as well as several Liberal members, rose in their places, and leave was accordingly given.

Sir H. JAMES: I desire in the first place to remove a false impression which may possibly exist in relation to this motion and its object. Some hon. members may feel that the motion is raised in the interests of a particular trade, and may, from that point of view, be regarded as hostile to the interests of our great dependency in the East. If such a view is entertained I will do all I can to dispel it. There is no one in the House who will not acknowledge that the House ought to be not only just, but even generous with regard to the interests of our Indian fellow-subjects. As our Indian fellow-subjects are not represented in this House it is our duty to see that their interests are not neglected in any course which the Government or this House shall take. And if that be the view of hon. members of this House, still more strongly, I believe, is it the view entertained by those in whose interests I am speaking to-night, namely, the Lancashire trades, and especially the textile trades of Lancashire. The prosperity of India represents the prosperity of Lancashire. (Cheers.) India is the greatest market of Lancashire, and anything which interferes unduly with the prosperity of our Indian Empire strikes more directly against Lancashire interests and trade than against any other portion of the whole country. I can assure the House that those with whom I am associated feel most strongly that they would be acting not only a selfish but an unpatriotic and suicidal part if they desired other than full consideration for the interests of India. Lancashire has no desire to see India, its competitor in the textile industry, interfered with. For years the cotton industry of India has been happily growing to a position of prosperity, until it has become a serious competitor with the textile industries of this country. Lancashire has nothing to fear from that competition. It is perfectly willing to enter into the contest with our Indian fellow-subjects; all it asks is that the race shall be run at level weights. (Cheers.) I hope the House will allow me, in a few sentences, to state the position of the different cotton trades in this country and in India. There are three sources from which the raw material, cotton fibre, is derived. There is, first, the American cotton, which represents the finer description of yarn. There is, secondly, the Indian cotton, which produces a coarse yarn, and which is used in Indian manufactures. A third market, the Egyptian, has come into existence, which, it is supposed, in the competition of finer goods, is about to play an important part. The House will hear this evening phrases describing the measures between the finer and coarser description of goods. I am sure my right hon. friend the Secretary for India will use the terms below twenties and above twenties. That is represented by the number of hanks to the pound. When the cotton is spun off in hanks the coarser is the heavier, and there are fewer hanks to the pound. The coarser cotton is below twenty, and sometimes as low as ten hanks; but the finer quality is lighter in weight, and runs as high as sixty or seventy hanks to the pound. The condition of the market may be described very shortly. In early times Great Britain had no competitor in India, and it was not till 1855, that the first mill was opened in Bombay. From that time to this there has been great progress in the course of the textile trade in India. (Hear, hear.) There has been a growth of mills, spindles and looms, and the result has been that India has taken almost the whole of the Japan and China trade in yarns from Great Britain and also manufactures large quantities of piece goods from the yarn, principally for home consumption in India, but also partly for export purposes. I say again that Lancashire does not grudge that increase for a moment if it is unweighted in the race, and is allowed an open market in India. It is only when that free market is denied to the trade of Great Britain and when a specific advantage is given to a competitor that the trade of Lancashire finds it necessary to make any complaint. This is not a mere matter of wayward complaint. It has always been the contention of Lancashire that the import duty is a dead weight upon its trade. It commenced to make that complaint long ago. I need not weary the House with any historical retrospect, therefore I do not trace the position of these duties. The system of import duties commenced under the old East India Company; they were felt to be a burden, and they were combated by the veteran Free Traders in this House. The matter was brought to the attention of the House in 1877, when the House passed its condemnation upon these duties, principally because they were, in its opinion, protected. The resolution of July, 1877, declared that the import duties upon cotton goods, being protective duties, were contrary to sound policy. An advance was made in the next two years. Between 1877-79 there was an alteration made in the levying of the duties. The line was drawn at 30 hanks to the pound, and no duty was imposed below 30. According to my right hon. friend's view that was no protective duty, because there was no competition in India above the 30's. India produced no cotton so fine as 30, and therefore as the India merchants came to the "30" market there was no protective duty at all it was argued. The House in April 1879 passed this resolution: "That the Indian import duties on cotton goods, being unjust alike to the Indian consumer and the English producer, ought to be abolished, and this House accepts the recent reduction of these duties as a step towards their total abolition, to which Her Majesty's Government was pledged." (Hear, hear.) The House will forgive me if I do not occupy its time by discussing what the effect of a resolution of the House of Commons may be. The merchants and operatives of Lancashire do not say that that resolution is positively to determine their rights; they do not say that that resolution will effect a revolution; but they think that it was an expression of opinion of the House of Commons condemnatory of the duties under circumstances that, I believe the House will see, were much more favourable to their maintenance than those which exist at the present moment. (Hear, hear.) Sir, with that resolution upon the records of the House, the commercial men of Lancashire believed that their position was safe, that no import duties would be imposed on the face of it, and that all the perfumes of Araby would not get rid of its effects. I am sure my right hon. friend shared that view, because in March of last year he said: "I would here remark that when Parliament had, after protracted discussion, arrived at a distinct resolution as to the policy that ought to be pursued in respect of this duty in India, it would not be open to the Executive Government to take a step reversing that decision, without the matter being discussed in this House." That was the view of my right hon. friend. He knows full well that the policy which was declared by the resolution of 1879 has been reversed, and that without discussion in this House. This is the first time there has been an opportunity of discussing the matter. The duties were imposed during the recess: they were never submitted to Parliament for its consideration, and their policy has never been discussed in this House; and I may appeal to my hon. friend below me (Sir D. Macfarlane), who objected to this motion this evening, whether it is unreasonable to ask for a discussion of the policy of the Government, which has been the reversal of the opinion of this House. (Hear, hear.) If we approach this question with the fullest consideration for the interests of India, will it not be better that the discussion should take place in the interests of the Government, and of the true and right position to be relatively occupied by the traders of this country and those of India? In 1882, in pursuance of the policy declared by Parliament, the duties were entirely abolished, the markets were opened, and under the free market system India progressed: her trade increased, driving Lancashire away from the markets of Japan and China, her spindles and looms increased, her yarns were produced in enormous quantities, coming within fair reach of the amount of yarn spun in this country. The trade of India all this time was flourishing and increasing, and the trade of this country was becoming depressed and each day less profitable; and not only was the position of the capitalist imperilled, but the employment of the operative becoming more precarious. This was the position when there came the necessity, which everyone admitted, of dealing with an Indian deficit. It was not a great deficit, but it was one that it was the duty of the Indian Government to deal with. We had a deficit which I think may be almost traced to the fact that the Indian Government thought it right to consider one particular interest. The deplorable fall in the value of the rupee had caused the officials of the Indian Government, particularly those who had their families in this country, to suffer considerable loss of income. The Government had to make up the deficit, and the course taken by the officials was to look round and see how they could best find the means of persuading the Government that they could receive this addition to their superannuations, pensions, pay, and allowances. They had friends in the country. The Bombay industry has become powerful. The Bombay Millowners' Association was at hand, and the Bombay Millowners' Association held out their hand to the civil servants of India, and appealed to them for help to start this agitation in India to secure an import duty, and from that import duty to find the means of paying this increase to the superannuations, pensions, pay, and allowances to the Anglo-Indian officials. The right hon. gentleman will probably tell you something of Indian opinion. It would be interesting to trace what is meant by that Indian opinion. It is impossible to suppose that a duty which is imposed for revenue purposes only, and which according to my right hon. friend will be borne by the consumers, the natives of India, will be borne by the consumers. Is it possible to suppose that there could have been any enthusiasm whatever on the part of the consumer and on the part of the native of India that he should be taxed by means of this import duty which he has to pay. Of course, nobody wishes to be taxed, and when we are told that the natives of India agitated to be taxed in order to pay the Anglo-Indian officials these superannuations and pensions, I ask hon. members to pause for a moment and ask themselves whether it is correct. The tale is told very frankly at page 48 of the Blue Book on the Indian Tariff Act and the cotton duties. Mr. Mehta, a member of the Legislative Council, said: "But I would appeal to other hon. members who are officials. The present financial exigency is owing not a little to the services having secured exchange compensation. They joined the Indians in agitating for the imposition of duties on cotton imports for the purpose of meeting the deficit largely due to exchange compensation. If after having secured such imposition they would refuse to support the moderate amendment of Mr. Fazulbhai"—another member of the Council—"to succour a native industry from being harassed and burdened, they would be open to the suspicion that their coaxing tones to induce the natives to join in the agitation against Manchester were suspiciously akin to the interested seductions—made familiar by Dickens—of 'Codlin's the friend, not Short.'" Here is the tale thus told of the Anglo-Indian officials joining with the millowners of Bombay to agitate against Manchester. Now, I ask any member of the House is it unreasonable that, when this agitation has been proceeding against Manchester, Manchester should ask at least to be heard in the matter. (Hear, hear.) This agitation has been carried on by the Anglo-Indian officials anxious to receive their pay and to lose nothing: it has been carried on against Manchester, against the trade that has lost by the fall of the rupee more than any other interest of the country. But whilst this agitation has been carried on against Manchester, are we to be told it would be unpatriotic on the part of Manchester to ask permission to state their case to the House? I am very much afraid my right hon. friend the Secretary of State, with the very best intentions in the world, has been misled by these officials. (Hear, hear). He is only an Indian minister; he is surrounded by Indian officials whose duty they may feel is to think only of the interests of India. My right hon. friend had heard all the representations and numerous memorials from the Bombay millowners and the Chamber of Commerce of Bombay. He has listened to every one of the statements that could be brought before him on the part of those who agitated against Manchester. I may say the feeling on the part of the Lancashire representatives is that he always bore in mind he was the Indian minister and never once thought he was a British minister, and a representative of British interests. (Hear, hear). I venture to ask my right hon. friend if he had his attention called to the desire of these agitators to have these duties imposed in August of last year and if he gave his decision upon the subject in December of last year? He had since these many representations read the Report of Mr. Westland, the minister who, when he went to obtain information, went to the millowners of Bombay and obtained the information that was to guide the Legislative Council of India from Bombay representatives and from Bombay millowners. All these my right hon. friend had before him. They represented one view of the matter. Now, I ask my right hon. friend with whom did he take counsel on behalf of Lancashire? (Hear, hear). There has been a practice in these matters. Right hon. gentlemen in the position of my right hon. friend have consulted such bodies as the Manchester Chamber of Commerce: they have consulted men on whose judgment they could well rely, and I now respectfully, if it is not unduly inquisitive, ask my right hon. friend with whom did he consult and learn practically—for there is an immense amount of practical knowledge required—with whom did he consult in order to obtain information as to how far the course he was about to pursue would injure the Lancashire trade? Were these interests considered at all? They could not be considered practically or even theoretically by any Indian minister without an appeal to practical men having practical knowledge of the subject. I must tell my right hon. friend there is a general feeling in Lancashire that he did not consult any one of those practical merchants or manufacturers with a knowledge of the subject, and they have a feeling at the present moment—a feeling which I hope will be removed by the statement of my right hon. friend—that their interests were totally neglected, and that the agitation against Manchester proceeded without those interests ever being heard on their own behalf. If this be the case—I hope it is not—will not my right hon. friend on reflection feel that it would have been well for him if he had taken advice from practical men and learned the effect of his policy upon the markets of this country? I see the Financial Secretary to the Treasury present. I wish he had asked the member for Oldham, in his capacity as the representative of that place, what he, with his great knowledge, thought of the matter. Did he consult the Financial Secretary of the Treasury? Did he consult anyone in a similar position, or did he not, as Lancashire thinks at the present moment, seek guidance alone from those who represent Indian interests and those who had been agitating against Manchester and therefore against the interests of this country? I hope it is not too much to say, on behalf of those who desire most strenuously to see Indian interests always considered, that it is not unreasonable that those interests should be considered with some regard to British interests also. There is no necessity why they should ever be opposed one to the other. Apparently that course has not been taken, hence the feeling which exists in Lancashire—a feeling which is of the strongest kind. I have now simply to point out to the House what it is my right hon. friend has done. He has yielded to the Indian representations; the agitation against Manchester has succeeded. My right hon. friend, I quite admit, deducted somewhat from the demands made upon him, but if Mr. Mehta is correct, the Anglo-Indians asked for a 5 per cent. import duty, and in that respect were comrades of the Bombay millowners. Now all British yarns, British manufactured goods, go into India with an import duty of 5 per cent. upon them. I take that duty as if there were no competition, or as if there were full countervailing duties against it. But an import duty alone is a detriment to trade, it is an obstacle to trade, and there can be no one, I should think, in this House, who would feel that, perhaps, more strongly than my right hon. friend himself, and those supporters of his who are sincere Free Traders must feel that they have been struggling against the imposition of import duties as much as they can. They have a desire to see markets opened, they have preached to the nations of the world the desirability that all markets should be open, and there must be some amongst my right hon. friend's own supporters who will feel with regret that our "position" when we appeal to protective countries is weakened by the act which has taken place. (Hear, hear.) It may be an act of necessity, but when next we preach the doctrine to Germany or to France, or even to our colonies, that protective duties are an evil in themselves and ought not to be imposed, the answer will come to us: "Why look at home; your Imperial Parliament has sanctioned an import duty. Under these circumstances how can you preach to us the folly of Protection and the virtue of Free Trade?" There are some veterans in this House who have not forgotten the Free Trade lesson of thirty years ago, and they will recall the days when we fought for open markets. I think there may possibly be some to-night who will regret that this import duty has been imposed. I am not going to say there is not a possibility of an import duty being justified under certain circumstances, which must be abnormal. Yet I hope I shall have the sanction of the House to the proposition that these import duties ought not to be imposed without their absolute necessity being proved up to the very hilt. The imposition of import duties produces dislocation and unsettlement of trade, and of course the burden must be borne by someone. Perhaps my right hon. friend will say the Indian consumer must bear the burden; but the Indian consumer will not have more money to spend, because you impose this import duty on British goods. He will have the same amount only to spend on cotton goods. Indeed, having this five per cent. duty to pay, or a charge of a farthing a pound more in the weight of the goods, the Indian consumer will have less to spend. There will be, therefore, much less in the volume of the goods bought of the English manufacturer. Producing so much less and receiving so much less for what he does produce, the burden falls on him. It may be said that, *primâ facie*, the Indian consumer does pay the import duty. Of course, his consignee has to pay the import duty, and he must try to get repayment in some way, and he may get it from the Indian consumer. But he may be beaten, as I will show, by his Indian competitor in the manufacture of the goods. At the best, the British producer stands only a chance of receiving the import duty back, and until he knows whether the market will bear an increased price or not, the trade becomes uncertain and unreliable to him. But my friend, in the face of the resolution of the House in 1879, says he will protect the Lancashire manufacturers themselves by putting an excise internal duty upon the production of the Indian merchant; and he thinks that by doing that he will burden him as he has burdened the British importer. But those who have a practical knowledge of the subject say that this countervailing duty is no protection to the British producer, that it fails entirely to counteract the import duty, and, in consequence of the fallacy of my right hon. friend, the British producer will have to trade under a system of protection, protection for the Indian producer against the Lancashire producer. For the imposition of the duty my right hon. friend selected twenties—which I understand means twenty hanks to the pound. So he relieves the Indian producer from all excise duty on everything below twenties. But he says to the Indian producer, "I will put the tax on your produced goods; I will put it on the yarn." The yarn has, of course, to be spun into grey cloth, bleached, coloured and printed, and the different processes represent material and labour. The import duty is placed on the British goods as they are landed, and therefore all the processes I have mentioned are taxed. But in the case of the Indian competitor, the yarn only is taxed, and the result is, that the difference between the tax on the yarn and the tax on the ultimate material is as 60 to 100. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, the Indian producer pays a 3 per cent. tax as compared with the tax of 5 per cent. on the Lancashire producer. That surely cannot be a countervailing duty. No doubt my right hon. friend, inspired by those Anglo-Indian officials who have entered into this comradeship with the Bombay merchants, will say that it would be inconvenient to put the excise tax on piece goods, because it was impossible to get any return of these goods from the Indian manufacturers. But the officials could ask for an estimate and impose a 5 per cent. duty on that estimate, which would correspond with the 5 per cent. duty put on the Lancashire goods. And this is what my friend calls perfect equality; the Indian manufacturer pays 3 per cent. duty as compared with the 5 per cent. paid by the British manufacturer. (Hear, hear.) The Indian manufacturer has got a "pull" over the British manufacturer, and a "pull" of the most important character. I am told that if you manufacture goods at twenties, and if you make them at twenty-two's, no unskilled person can tell the difference. What then is the position of the two competitors in the market? The Indian producer is enabled to produce this "twenties" material at 3d., and the British producer turns out twenty-two's at an equal price. Say it would be a fraction dearer. But he has to pay a farthing import duty on the pound, and it therefore costs him 3¼d. a pound. The Indian producer goes on to the market and says he has goods as good as any of the English goods which the English producer charges 3¼d. a pound for, and he will offer them at 3d., or say 3⅛d., a pound. The English producer is therefore driven out of the market, and has no possible chance of success. It is said that the duties are equal and corresponding, but I have been assured by those who have practical knowledge of the subject that there is a great difference between them, to the advantage of the untaxed and the disadvantage of the taxed competitor. If we fear at the present time, there is far greater fear for the future. (Hear, hear.) There is this in connection with the markets which causes men engaged in the trade to feel the gravest anxiety. Our principal supplies of raw material come from America. British manufacturers pay lower prices than they formerly paid—I believe that prices are lower than ever they were in the history of the trade. (Hear, hear.) Where formerly India had no fine cotton at her disposal, she can now pay for the American cotton at a price which will enable her to compete in these finer qualities. She will, therefore, come into the market competing in these goods with a differential duty of two per cent., and she is laying out her mills for the purpose of using these finer qualities of cotton and competing with the British trade. The Government have made an exemption from the import duties so as to allow all machinery to go in free, and the organisation of Bombay millowners is erecting mills which will be able to produce the finer material from the American cotton with an acknowledged advantage to the extent of the two per cent. duty. Low twenties are now being produced at many mills in India, and the Lancashire manufacturer is being driven out of the market by the five per cent. duty. Lancashire has made her protest as quickly as possible. India has been progressing, and has arrived at a wonderful pitch. From the days when the first cotton mills were erected in 1855, in Bombay, they have continued to spring into existence, until now there are 141 cotton mills in India. In 1882 there were 1,550,000 spindles in India, and now there are 3,500,000. The result is that India is producing 170,000,000lbs. of yarn against the 40,000,000lbs. of British yarn which go into India. Whilst India has been progressing, has the British trade been prospering? According to the Chancellor of the Exchequer you have to look at the volume of trade, and not at the prices. I will not enter into that, but I will ask him is there not a point beyond which a fall in prices becomes a calamity? You may say to the agriculturist that he is producing a necessary of which every man is the consumer, and if the consumer gets his produce cheaply, that is a fact to be gloried in. But does my right hon. friend carry that doctrine to the full extent? This country is a great producing country, and its export trade represents about 200 millions of money. Would my right hon. friend wish to see a fall in prices in all trades such as would reduce that 200 millions to only 120 millions? In some trades there must be a line below which it is not desirable that prices should fall. The agriculturist is a passive sufferer. (Hear, hear.) He must hold his land. He cannot shut it up even if he does not receive his rent, though in some cases the land has gone out of cultivation. But in the case of a millowner carrying on his mill, and paying from £500 to £1,000 a week in wages, if he does not receive that amount back, the time comes when he must close his mill. My right hon. friend's glorification in falling prices will not be shared by the capitalist who is losing his capital, nor by the nation. If this fall of prices continues, it means the closing of these mills—(hear, hear)—and a sad addition to the already swollen ranks of the army of unemployed. I have spoken with satisfaction of the increased prosperity of the textile trade in India. I wish I could speak of prosperity in the textile trade in Lancashire. Say what you will, that trade was never so depressed as it is to-day. (Hear, hear.) The volume of trade represents nothing to men who are selling their goods at a loss, and there is much astonishment at the speech which the hon. member for Leigh (Mr. C. Wright) made the other day. He then said that Lancashire never was as prosperous as it is to-day, and that he had more money than he knew what to do with. (Laughter.) I understand that he is engaged in a trade of a very peculiar character and of a very high degree of fineness. He has no Indian trade and knows nothing about it. But there are people in Lancashire who have suffered from the effects of this duty. At this moment there are in Blackburn 23,000 looms lying idle on account of the policy of the Government in this matter. What does that represent? It means that some 7,000 people are unemployed. Does the Chancellor of the Exchequer glory over that fact? This closing of mills is progressing, and Lancashire members will tell you that the greatest alarm is felt lest what has occurred in Blackburn should occur elsewhere. It is said that the millowners of Lancashire have not made any returns. But we have returns from public companies. The 93 Oldham companies have a share capital of £3,874,000 and a loan capital of £3,330,000, and while shareholders have been paying interest on the loan capital at the rate of 2½ per cent., the mills have been working at a loss for the past three years. In 1892 that loss was £101,000; in 1893 it was £72,767. In 1894 the loss fell to £15,000, but what might be called profitable work was only done in the early part of the year, and was due to extraordinary circumstances. Since then the loss has been going on increasing. Now, Sir, when is this to end? Is this trade in a condition in which an artificial burden can be gratuitously imposed upon it? With losses growing and with this further burden, do not you think the time is coming when the mills will not be kept open? The trade with China and Japan has shown us an example. The Lancashire trade with those countries is decreasing. In the six years ending 1882, England had two-thirds of the trade in yarns with China and Japan; in the four years ending 1892 we had only one-fifth of that trade and India had four-fifths. In 1893 that trade fell off from the large figures it had previously reached, but the Indian traders would not bear that loss patiently. In alliance with the Anglo-Indian officials they asked for a benefit to recoup them for the fall in the rupee. The trader in Lancashire has taken no such step, but has patiently borne the falling price. All he asks is that reasons should be given why this additional burden should be placed upon him. I hope the House understands how the fall affects the English producer. There has been a fall in prices from two causes. The rupee value of goods fell in India on account of competition. Then came also the fatal fall in the exchange aggravated by the closing of the mints, and the result is that in a few years prices have diminished 70 per cent. on piece goods and 59 per cent. on yarns. This has had to be borne by Lancashire. The fall has, to some extent, been recompensed by the great fall in the price of raw material, but it was not enough to compensate the producer for the double loss. The question is whether he can bear these new duties, and whether or not it is a duty which will have the effect of bringing industrial enterprise to an end. "My right hon. friend may say, "What is the policy that you propose and what would you have done?" That is asking us to bear a grave responsibility. I would, however, have done my best to learn the feelings of those connected with the industry. I do not put forward an alternative policy because I do not know enough of India, but there are those connected with India who say that there are sources of taxation that might afford equally good results with less injustice than by the imposition of these duties. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has gloried in low prices. What does he think of the rich Indian paying less taxes than poorer men in Lancashire? What, then, does my right hon. friend say to a well-regulated income tax? (Laughter.) What a magnificent field there is for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to bring within the scope of his measures the wealthy Indian with his hoards of silver and gold. What a fine scope there is for the application of the graduated death duties to the native Princes with their hoards of precious metals, and what an opportunity there is provided here to relieve the poor consumer in India of the taxation that we have imposed upon him by these import duties. (Hear, hear.) I suggest these points to the consideration of my right hon. friend. (Cheers.) I have had an important duty to face in representing this great interest to the House. It was the wish of the Lancashire owners that their wishes should be placed before the House with the fullest moderation. I hope I have succeeded in doing that; it was the intention in my mind. Only one word in conclusion. I do hope that the words I have spoken on behalf of this great industry have not been spoken in vain. I also hope that the last words of the Secretary of India have not been spoken on the subject. If it should turn out that they have, then I must say that I am afraid the last words of Lancashire have not been spoken. (Hear, hear.) There cannot be an end to this question as it stands at present. There must be many loyal supporters of the Government who know how deep and true is the feeling in Lancashire on this question, and those friends will tell the Secretary for India that the demands they make this evening are not the demands of capital asking for the redemption of inflated profits. This is not an attempt to secure great gains. This is a demand from the humblest men in Lancashire engaged in a trade whose prosperity is threatened, fearful of a time, perhaps not far remote, when the towns of busy Lancashire may be depopulated, when mills will be closed, and looms silent, and when the men will search in vain for means to earn their daily bread. (Cheers.)

The right hon. gentleman concluded by moving the adjournment of the House.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: I agree with my right hon. friend that it is for the public interest that this question should be brought under the consideration of the House. I think the time has arrived when a clear statement of the facts of the case should be made in the presence of what, after all, is the supreme tribunal of this country. Misrepresentation has been circulated not only in England, but also in India, and therefore, on that account, while asking the House to deal with this question as a whole, I will not simply confine myself to that one aspect of the case which my right hon. friend has submitted to the House. Before, however, I enter upon further discussion of this question, I should like to say one word in self-defence, and, what is far more important, a word in defence of those with whom I associate in England and in India, and upon whom my right hon. friend has poured what I may call his eloquent scorn. (Cheers.) My right hon. friend has spoken of the Anglo-Indian officials, some of the most distinguished servants of the Crown both in England and in India. (Cheers.) He has spoken of agitators in India to whose blandishments I have succumbed. I shall tell the House before I finish what has been the part that has been taken in India on this question, but I cannot allow another moment to elapse without repudiating in the strongest terms that there has been any agitation, any conspiracy, on behalf of any class in India in order to deal with this financial difficulty. (Cheers.) You might as well charge the Chancellor of the Exchequer with entering into some combination—I care not on which side of the House the view is taken—with interested classes when he submits his financial proposal. (Cheers.) Perhaps my right hon. friend is not aware that the distinguished man who is at present Finance Minister in India is a man of the highest standing and of the most unblemished reputation, a man who has served the Crown for a long period of years and who has received a signal mark of favour from the Crown for his public services. (Cheers.) My right hon. friend described him as an agitator in combination with a certain class of officials who want to raise their own salaries, and that he has submitted proposals not to me in England, but to the Legislative Council of India, while the Viceroy whom my right hon. friend has chiefly attacked is Lord Lansdowne, who ruled India with such success for a period of five years. (Cheers.) Are we to have men of this character and class, men who by their deeds have shown that they take the deepest interest in the welfare of India, described as entering into a combination with Anglo-Indian officials, agitating against Manchester, and bringing to bear certain influences on the Secretary of State in order to join in that conspiracy? (Cheers.)

Sir H. JAMES: I never said anything of the sort. I read out the statement of Mr. Mehta to which reference was made. I quoted his own words, but I never referred to Lord Lansdowne.

Mr. H. FOWLER: There was, however, an expression which my right hon. friend used with reference to myself. He did not mean it as a compliment, but I accept it as the greatest compliment. He told the House that I am only an Indian Minister. Yes, that is the post I hold. (Cheers.) It is to India I am responsible as well as to this House—(cheers)—and when my right hon. friend charges me with sacrificing the interests of England to the interests of India he will need very satisfactory proof. He has not given that proof in the course of his speech: but I will show my right hon. friend that the censures upon me in India are quite as severe as the censures upon me in Lancashire. One of the leading organs of public opinion in Lancashire states that "the conspiracy of the Indian service, the Indian cotton trade and Mr. Fowler have succeeded." About the same date there comes from India a statement that "the sacrifice of Indian interests is the principle underlying this measure, and it is a principle to which a Radical Secretary of State has given his *imprimatur*." Further, I observe that it has been stated, not perhaps in a very influential quarter of India —that I should be called "the Secretary of State for Lancashire; not the Secretary of State for India." (Laughter.) That emboldens me to go on with my argument, for having shown the House that I am attacked from two different points of the compass, it is impossible for both to be true. (Laughter.) I cannot have sacrificed Lancashire to India, and at the same time have sacrificed India to Lancashire. (Renewed laughter). I have endeavoured in dealing, not with my own financial proposals but with the financial proposals of the Government of India, to steer an even keel and to do what I thought was fair justice to the interests of Lancashire and to the interests of India. It is not possible to thoroughly understand this question without, in two or three sentences, considering its history. My right hon. friend gave the House a short but interesting account of the various stages through which this question had passed; but I think he ommitted one or two points, to which it is my duty to call attention in order that the House may quite understand that this is not a novel proposal on the part of the Government of India but that duties upon cotton imports have been imposed with a short interval not only during the time of the East India Company, but ever since the Government of India has been handed over to the Crown. Originally these duties were of a protective character, and were, as now, 5 per cent.; they were raised at one time to 10 per cent.: there were various reductions down to the period to which my right hon. friend has alluded, when what I may call the commencement of the agitation in this House against the Indian cotton duties took place which soon assumed a real and substantial form. These duties were attacked entirely on the ground of their protective character. That was the ground taken by one of the ablest of Lancashire cotton spinners, who was subsequently Under-Secretary for India, and whose death we all deplore—Mr. J. K. Cross. He made one of the earliest speeches on this question, and he attacked these duties solely on the ground of there being no excise duties in India, but simply import duties on cotton goods imported. My right hon. friend spoke of the part taken by stalwart Free Traders with reference to these duties, but at that time there were differences of opinion about them amongst the most stalwart Free Traders. No one will question that the late Mr. Fawcett was one of the soundest and wisest of Free Traders who ever spoke on this subject; and he made in this House a speech which I may quote all the more readily because I have not pursued the policy he recommended. I want this House to see how this question then affected the mind of a member who had taken the deepest interest in Indian affairs, and who was himself a most pronounced Free Trader. He said: "Frequent references had been made in this debate to the principles of political economy. If the House were to take the abstract principles of that science and apply them cut and dried without considering the social and political circumstances of the case, they would act more like zealots than politicians—(Col. Howard Vincent: 'Hear, hear,' and laughter)—and might produce an amount of discontent in India which would seriously imperil the integrity of the empire." This is the sentence to which I want to draw special attention: "Statesmen must consider not merely whether a particular tax is theoretically bad, but whether it creates discontent amongst the people, and looking at the question in that light, he asserted that there was no single tax levied in India which was so satisfactory to the people of the country as a revenue raised by import duties." My right hon. friend alluded to the debate of 1877, and to the resolution then passed, but he was significantly silent with reference to an important amendment to that resolution, which was proposed by the noble lord the late first Lord of the Admiralty, who then represented the India Office in the House: the noble lord the member for Middlesex, (Lord George Hamilton). The noble lord would not accept that resolution—namely: "that the duties were protective in their character, contrary to sound commercial policy and ought to be repealed without delay"—without this addition—"so soon as the financial condition of India will permit." (Hear, hear.) That is the crux of the situation, that was the condition on which the House passed the resolution. The House did not then repeal the duties. My right hon. friend would have led anyone to assume that in consequence of that resolution the duties were forthwith repealed. He said that the merchants, manufacturers, and millowners, made their arrangements on the strength of that resolution of the House. That is not the case. The import duties were not repealed till 1882, and they were not repealed because they were duties upon cotton goods, but they were repealed because at that time the financial condition of India allowed of the repeal of all import duties. (Hear, hear.) The argument used in that debate had mainly reference to the coarser counts of which my right hon. friend spoke. This is a point on which stress is to be laid, as it has a bearing on the present condition of affairs; it was pressed in the debate as it had been in Lord Salisbury's despatches of 1874 and 1875. Mr. Sidebottom, who spoke for the cotton trade, said, "We have already lost our trade in the coarser goods, which can be supplied more cheaply by Indian manufacturers." In a subsequent debate, Mr. Briggs states that "the coarser goods were once sent from this country, but that that trade had disappeared because the duties were repealed too late." The argument used in 1875, 1877, and 1879, was just the same argument my right hon. friend has used to-night—namely, that the existence of that duty had prevented Manchester or Lancashire from making the coarse counts, and that if the duties were repealed, the coarser counts would be manufactured, and the trade would revive. I will give statistics which will show how that view has been carried out. Fourteen years have elapsed since those duties were repealed. The trade in the coarser counts has decreased, and decreased, and decreased, until it has reached the vanishing point; and there has been no protection on one side or the other, but there has been a free and open market. My right hon. friend cited lugubrious figures as to the decrease of the cotton trade in India during the last few years. I can only tell him that in 1887-88, the value of British cotton piece goods imported into India was Rx. 23,000,000; in 1892-93 it was Rx. 22.000,000, and in 1893-94, which he has described as a period of nnparalled depression, it reached Rx 28,319,805. (Cheers.) We then come to the period with which he has dealt, the period of the Budget of 1894: when the Government of India, and the Government of Great Britain were face to face with what I have described as the financial condition of India. He asks, "Why had you to put these duties on?" And he gave a certain explanation, I know where he got it from; he stated that salaries had been increased and that a deficit had been created in India, which would not have existed under other circumstances. That is not the case. When the Budget of 1894 was under discussion, the value of the rupee stood at 1s. 2d., and the year that has passed has reduced that value to 1s. 1d.—a difference in the financial position which was not contemplated twelve months ago. That fall in exchange will represent at the present time Rx 2,500,000. Take the figures we had before us when we came to consider the financial position. The net difference in the exchange value—that is the net loss on exchange in respect to our sterling remittances as as between the year 1878 and the year 1894—represent no less a sum than Rx 10.253,000, and the loss this year is Rx 12.753,000. Therefore, the Government were face to face with a very difficult and serious financial question; and what was proposed? The Government of India estimated a deficit of Rx 3,000,000, and that deficit they proposed to meet by import duties. I am not aware of any of the agitators spoken of, of any pressure brought to bear in India upon England. I know that Lord

Kimberley was at the head of the India Office, and Lord Lansdowne was Viceroy, and their communications took place by telegram. I have read them over and over again, and I can say that they had reference exclusively to the financial exigencies of the case. The Government of India asked for permission to impose cotton duties, and the Home Government declined. The result of that refusal was that the Famine Appropriation Fund was suspended, that the grants to the provincial governments were suspended and contributions were raised for the provincial rates; and ultimately the financial Minister of India budgeted a deficit of only £300,000. What was said by Lord Kimberley in reply to the protestations of the Government of India against the refusal to sanction the putting of import duties upon cotton? He said this: "If after an interval sufficient to judge of the financial position as affected by the Tariff Act, by the course of exchange, and by other circumstances, there was not an improvement Her Majesty's Government would be prepared to receive further representations from the Government of India on the subject of imposing import duties upon cotton manufactures." After Lord Kimberley left the India Office I had to face this question. My right hon. friend has somewhat imputed to me a breach of faith with the House upon that point, and I am sensitive to any charge of that character. I stated my own view within forty-eight hours of my appointment in reply to the hon. and gallant gentleman opposite. I then said there was no opposition to the imposition of these duties if they were met by corresponding excise duties. But I added that if there was anything of a protective character involved I should not think them proper duties to be imposed without a preliminary discussion in the House of Commons. I wrote a despatch to the Government of India, in which I clearly pointed out that we would not be parties to duties which were protective, but that, if they could suggest a mode by which every element of protection could be removed, we would accept their proposal. On July 27th one of the members for Manchester put to me the question whether in view of the resolution passed on July 1st, 1877, with reference to Indian import duties on cotton goods, I could give an assurance that such duties would not be imposed without an opportunity being given to the House of expressing an opinion on the subject. I replied that the resolution of the House to which the hon. baronet (Sir W. Houldsworth) referred dealt with duties that were protective in their nature. The imposition of duties which would not be protective in their character would not be affected by that resolution. That makes my own position perfectly clear. (Cheers.) In introducing the Indian Budget of 1894 I dealt with the case at great length. And if during that time my right hon. friend had been present he would have heard a distinct declaration on my part, that I was in favour of complying with the request of the Indian Council if the element of protection could be removed.

Sir WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH: I would call the right hon. gentleman's attention to a subsequent resolution passed in 1879.

Mr. FOWLER: Yes; but a good deal happened during the course of last Session. There was a very interesting discussion on this question in the House of Lords, and I think I should be neglecting my duty if I did not call the attention of this House rather minutely to what passed on that occasion. There were present in the House of Lords two ex-Viceroys of India, there was an ex-Secretary of State, and there was also a distinguished soldier who had spent forty years of his life in India, and who had been commander of the forces there for a long time; and those noble lords called attention to a point which my right hon. friend has not alluded to to-night, but which no Government can ignore, and which I am sure this House will not ignore, namely, the political difficulty which has arisen in reference to this question. Let me read what was said by Lord Lansdowne, who had just come back from India, who at least my right hon. friend will admit is an authority on this question, and whom he will not speak of as an Anglo-Indian official agitator. Lord Lansdowne said: "There was never a moment when it was more necessary to counteract the growing impression that our financial policy in India is dictated by selfish considerations. I am not one of those who regard with exaggerated alarm every bazaar rumour which may be telegraphed over to this country from India; but it is idle to conceal from ourselves that many causes are at work which should make us pause before we do anything to shake the confidence of the people of India in the absolute disinterestedness of our rule. Western ideas are spreading with rapidity in the minds of an Eastern population not yet by any means fitted to receive them. The Government must make up its mind to be misrepresented, and may in ordinary cases console itself with the hope that the truth may prevail; but it should think twice before it supplies the party of agitation with a real grievance and the materials for a real indictment to which no reply will be made because no reply is possible. It is a gross libel to say that either of the great political parties in this country will for the sake of a passing advantage deny to the people of India the fair play which they expect from this country." (Cheers.) I will quote also from the speech of Lord Roberts. He approached the subject not as a financier, for he did not profess to be one, but as a man who knew something of the political condition of India; and no Government could disregard warnings coming from an authority like that. He said that "while as a soldier he believed that the prosperity of India depended on the maintenance of our naval and military supremacy, he would say as an Englishman who had lived more than forty years in the country that he knew it depended to even a greater extent on the contentment of the people and their experience of the advantages of British rule. The extraordinary position we occupied in India was mainly due to native reliance on our integrity and honesty of purpose, and determination to do what was right and best for them. If this feeling were once destroyed the consequences would be disastrous." (Cheers.) But a still more important speech, from a political point of view, was delivered in the House of Lords on that occasion by a nobleman whom we knew as a member of this house for many years, and as a Lancashire member, too, and who himself had been Secretary of State for India for six years. What did Lord Cross say—and this is the last public deliverance of an official leader of the Conservative party on this question? He said: "All I desire to add, and I have always said so with regard to the affairs of India, is that this is no party question whatever. It is a question that must be decided by the Government of the day—it is for them to decide whether the course hitherto adopted should be persisted in or not. They have the information to enable them to judge. Do the Government believe that without the re-imposition of these duties Indian finances could not be properly balanced? If they do there is an end to the question. If not, are the duties not to be re-imposed simply because of some kind of fad about Free Trade, which ought not to enter into the discussion of a question as between England and India. If the Government can see no other way of balancing the finances of India they must, at the proper time, consider the question of re-imposing the duties on cotton." Now I have cleared the way as to what I said to the House with regard to what I was prepared to do if the protective element could be destroyed—because we do not share the noble lord's opinion as to its being a fad about Free Trade: we believed it was a reality and a principle to which we were prepared to adhere. We put ourselves in communication with the Government of India. My right hon. friend has not quoted from, or even replied to, the very able minute of Sir James Westland, which I have laid upon the Table; but I will ask the House to consider what it says, and the facts are not open to argument—I have never seen them challenged. Sir James Westland says: "Indian mills do not spin yarns of a higher class than thirties." My right hon. friend has frankly admitted this; though he thinks it may be extended in the future. At any rate, at the present time they do not extend it; and that is proved by these facts. There are 141 mills in India, and 140 of those mills, one in Calcutta alone being excluded, furnish statistics to the Finince Minister. Those mills spun last year 345 million pounds of yarn, of which 215 million was spun at Bombay, which justifies one in regarding that city as the seat of the Indian cotton trade. Close on 20 per cent. were tens and 59·63 were above tens and under twenties. Therefore, you have 79½ per cent. of the whole goods spun in Indian mills under twenties. Above twenties and under thirties were 19 per cent.: therefore you have, very much bearing out what was stated by Sir James Westland, 98½ per cent. of the goods spun in India under thirties and only a very small quantity—1½ per cent—above thirties. And it is upon the latter small quantity that this competition is going to arise. Why do Indian mills spin so largely these coarser counts? Sir James Westland says the reason is that the Indian cotton does not give a sufficient length of fibre for the higher counts. And the accuracy of these statements is testified to by statistics furnished by the collector of customs at Bombay, who says the export from Bombay of Indian spun yarns above twenty-fours is not one-half per cent. of the whole amount. Therefore, Sir James Westland was justified in maintaining that the industry of India is chiefly concerned with the coarser qualities and that of Lancashire with the finer qualities, and that unless they approach something like over-lapping lines there is nothing like competition between them. What becomes of the imported yarns? They are used for hand-loom weaving. the mills take none of them. I wonder whether my right hon. friend is aware that an enormous number of looms which in India weave yarns for piece goods are in cottage homes. The idea of imposing an excise duty on cottage industries through the length and breadth of India is utterly impracticable. What is the position of these yarns? The House has already been told that the consumption is 340 millions, of which 170 millions was exported, no doubt forming a part of the trade to which my right hon. friend has alluded, but all in the coarser counts. No duty affects them, no competition arises there, and on Lancashire no duty is imposed. There are 129 millions used for this hand-loom weaving of the coarser quality for the benefit of the native population of the poorest character, and only 74 millions is used by the mills. I have means of communicating with quite as competent advisers in Lancashire, perhaps, as my right hon. friend has.

Sir H. JAMES: Name.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: No, I am not going to disclose names, my right hon. friend is surely not the man to make a demand of that kind. Did he think it fair game to suggest that I an ignorant man, knowing nothing of the cotton trade, would dare to deal with this difficult and delicate question in an autocratic spirit without consulting anybody? That is not the way in which I discharge the duties of my post. (Hear, hear.) I have information, it may be sound or it may be unsound, but at all events I have been guided by that information, and the result of the position was that when the Indian Government proposed an import duty of 3½ per cent. on yarns, and 5 per cent. on piece goods, my advisers were of opinion that we must have a uniform duty both on yarns and piece goods. And it is a very singular thing that the Indian argument was exactly the converse of that used by my right hon. friend. His argument is that the duty you impose is only 3 per cent. on the Indian manufacturer, while you impose a duty of 5 per cent. on the Lancashire manufacturer. What the Indian people said was that to put a uniform duty of 5 per cent., was practically charging them 1½ per cent. more than the Lancashire manufacturer. That is the ground they took up; and they gave reasons for it—namely, the position of their mills, the cost of the machinery, having to buy coals in India, and the duty paid upon imported stores and materials. I need not trouble the House with the effect which has been produced in reference to these modified proposals. I don't know whether the right hon. gentleman has read the debates in the India Council ont his question. He has quoted some criticisms of Mr. Mehta, but he did not quote the replies nor the very able arguments which were used by distinguished Anglo-Indians, and by even more distinguished natives, against the imposition of excise duties at all. The excise duty they were willing to accept was drawn at a limit of twenty-fours but I stood to my guns and put the limit at twenties, and that was carried by a majority of only one. And now there are three main objections to the policy of the Government. The first is that we have violated the principles of Free Trade; the second is that we have imposed a heavy burden on Lancashire; and the third that the excise duty is inadequate for the purpose of preventing protection. On the other hand, India says that it is far below the limit at which any effective competition begins, so far as they are concerned. to be oppressive. As to the first objection, my hon. friend in his speech alluded to our preaching to foreign nations, but very dexterously inserted in his argument a change of one of the factors. He said "import duties." But import duties and protective duties are not one and the same thing. (Hear, hear.) They are totally distinct. There is no principle of Free Trade violated by the imposition of an import duty unless protection accompanies it. (Hear, hear.) The abolition of customs duties may be very desirable or not, but we have never recommended foreign countries to abolish customs, but rather protective duties, which are a very different thing. What did Cobden himself say—and I put this to my Lancashire friends who have denounced me as violating the principles of Free Trade? He said, "What is Free Trade? Not a pulling down of customs houses. By Free Trade we mean the abolition of all protective duties." And Mr. Laing, the Finance Minister of India—a Free Trader himself—said that Free Trade does not mean that there shall be no taxes, but that the taxes shall be levied solely for revenue. Every member of this House will admit that this is a Free Trade country. But we raise £20,000,000 of our revenue out of our customs duties. Is it a violation of Free Trade to raise taxes on tea—where there is no corresponding production at home; or on spirits, where there is a production at home, and where in addition to the import duty we levy a corresponding excise duty on the spirits which are thus made. That is the principle that regulates our policy—our Free Trade policy. And bear in mind, the consumer pays. Of course, if, as in America, you allow the native manufacturer to produce the same article, and do not charge him an excise duty, whilst you impose an import duty, he raises his price accordingly, and puts the money in his own pocket. But there is no room for that in connection with the system which we adopt. The next charge is that we have imposed a heavy burden on Lancashire. My right hon. friend drew a picture which I am sorry to contemplate. He must not suppose that the Government have no sympathy for the state of trade in Lancashire, but we do not agree that the depression is aggravated by the burdens put on cotton. I deny the right hon. gentleman's proposition. Who pays the tax? We levy an import duty on a large product of India tea, and last year the tea grown in India paid within a fraction of three millions to the revenue of this country. Is that a tax on the people of India? No it is a tax on the consumer in this country and if the Chanceller of the Exchequer should come to this House and ask the House either to double the duties on tea or take them off altogether the effect of that would be seen in every grocer's shop in Great Britain next morning in the raising or lowering of the price of tea. The tax will be paid by the people as all import duties are—by the consumer. I quite admit that excessive duties so raise prices as to discourage and diminish consumption but I do not think that a duty of a half-penny in 10d., which is the duty now imposed, will affect the consumption of cotton goods of the highest quality and most costly description, and if it does the Indian Government will have the remedy in its own hands, and it will have every inducement to adopt it, because if the duty discourages consumption there will be no revenue. The whole foundation of the argument is that these customs duties shall be paid into the Indian Exchequer. Then as to the third objection that the excise duty is inadequate. We don't levy this duty on the coarser counts because there is no importation of them. It has dwindled down to an infinitesimal figure in the last few years. Some time ago of these coarser counts, under twenty-fours, we sent to Bombay 1,890,000 pounds weight. In 1872, they went down to 234,000 lbs. In 1879, to 166,000 lbs.; in 1884, when the duties were taken off and no shadow of protection existed and the Lancashire spinners had the opportunity of pushing the trade if they had wished it, they went down to 55,804 lbs. Last year they went down to 8,500 lbs. Well, Sir, it is said by the Indian people, as to counts between twenties and twenty-fours, that you are levying a tax because the competition does not begin up to that point. I have made a promise on this point to the Indian people. I have said that if they will prove that the limit of twenty is too low, it shall be raised to twenty-four; and if there is no effective competition between twenty and twenty-four power is reserved to the Indian Government, with the consent of the Secretary of State, to alter that figure. I say to my Lancashire friends that the same principle must apply to them If they can prove that this dividing line of twenty is unjust to them, I am equally pledged to remedy that evil. The principle on which the Government have gone is that there should be no protection. (Hear, hear.) No one will say that it is possible in the imposition of any new tax, especially a complicated tax of excise, to deal at the first moment with all the possibilities of the case, or strike off a measure which will not require amendment. I say frankly and openly to the Lancashire manufacturers, as I have already said to the Scotch manufacturers in dealing with dyed yarns, if you will prove that there is any injustice done to you, I will do my best to remedy that injustice. That is a question for inquiry, and for inquiry alone, and it is impossible to discuss it across the floor of this House, and I for one will not attempt to waste the time of the House by doing it. Given the injustice, I will endeavour to remove it. (Hear, hear.) Our reasons for imposing this duty are those of financial necessity. We are in these difficulties from two sources of increasing expenditure. It is a matter of history of which this House is well aware that we have added 30,000 soldiers to the army of India—10,000 English and 20,000 native—and money for them must be found. Then nature has added in 10 years 23,000,000 to the population of India, and that means an increased cost of government. But the real and great evil has been the constant fall in the exchange. (Opposition cheers.) The member for Sleaford (Mr. Chaplin) cheers that. I am not going to discuss what is the proper remedy, but I do not dispute the fact, and the fact is that week by week and day by day the cost of India is increasing as the rupee falls in value, and if these duties were abolished at any time in the past it was because financial conditions admitted of it, and if they are imposed now they are imposed because financial reasons require it. Is my right hon. friend prepared to say that import duties are to be placed on every thing else and Manchester cotton goods left out? (Hear, hear.) If you were to take off all import duties it would be a question of millions. On what principle could you justify the exemption of any class? (An hon. member: Put them on machinery.) An hon. member says machinery. Is there any tax on machinery in Lancashire? (Hear, hear.) Can you not buy at the lowest prices and in the cheapest markets? And why should not the people of India do the same thing? And bear in mind that they have to pay the cost of freight and insurance, and have a heavy depreciation owing to the climate. (Hear, hear.) In dealing with this matter we must remember that India is not a self-governing country. What is the position as to cotton duties in other parts of the British Empire? Take Canada, for instance. There the duty on yarn is 25 per cent., except the counts above forties. The duty on woven goods unbleached is $22\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and on bleached 25 per cent. and on dyed and coloured goods 30 per cent. At the Cape of Good Hope there is a uniform duty of 12 per cent., and in New Zealand a duty of 20 per cent., excepting on sewing cottons or yarns, and 10 per cent. with certain exceptions on woven goods. The people of India know all this. You cannot explain to them with the accuracy you can explain here all the distinctions of the fiscal arrangements between self-governing colonies and countries like India. But I need not dwell on this. Beyond all question the imposition of these duties is popular in India, and if the Imperial Government had taken the course which my right hon. friend thinks they ought to have taken, it would have had a very grave political effect. He talks about agitators, but I will tell him that every authority for the expression of public opinion in India believes we have acted rightly on this occasion, and widespread dissatisfaction would be felt in India if we disregarded their feelings in the matter. You ought not to defy public opinion in this matter. You may try to educate and improve it, but we have to deal with the facts as they are. I have only to say, further, that as in 1894 my noble friend, Lord Kimberley, in the exercise of constitutional power refused to sanction these duties, I, equally in the exercise of constitutional power, have sanctioned them. (Cheers.) I am prepared at the proper time and place to argue that there has been nothing oppressive, unprecedented or illegal in what has been done. This is the way in which the financial policy has been regulated, and in a day or two I will lay on the Table of the House, the most masterly despatches of two distinguished men who have held my office—the Duke of Argyll and the Marquis of Salisbury—who have dealt with this point of the relationship between the Home Government and that of India on the general and financial policy, and when I have done so, I am sure the House will be satisfied that whether the course now taken be right or wrong, it is strictly in accordance with precedent. Our case in one word is this: the state of the finances of India necessitated additional taxation; the opinion of the Indian Government and people was unanimous in favour of customs duties on imports; the Home Government could not permanently compel the people of India to exempt their largest imports from these duties; we were compelled both in the interests of India and of our own manufacturing population to require that these import duties should not be protective whenever goods were imported from abroad and were in competition with similar goods manufactured in India. We say in explanation of this that there is not, and has not been for many years, any effective competition between India and foreign countries in respect of the coarser cotton goods which, we allege, are consumed in India by the very poorest class of the population; that to tax these goods would be a grievous and an oppressive direct tax on the poorest part of the natives for which there is no justification. (Hear, hear.) We say that goods of a finer quality are not produced to any extent in India, but that Lancashire has a monopoly of them, and, I believe, will continue to have it. (Hear, hear.) We further say that if it should appear on clear evidence that the Government have drawn the line too high, or that its operation does not remove any and every protective character, Her Majesty's Government will, in concert with that of India, consider the matter with a view of loyally carrying out their intention to avoid protective injustice. (Cheers.) That is the policy of Her Majesty's Government, and that is the policy which I have endeavoured, feebly and imperfectly perhaps, to pursue during the time I have been in office. I believe I have tried to do my duty to India as Indian Secretary, and that I have not neglected the interests of the people of Lancashire. I and my colleagues are, of course, responsible to this House, which is the ultimate tribunal of all these questions. We know the consequences that will follow if this House should censure the administrative acts of the Government. (Hear, hear.) We shall not shrink from accepting that responsibility if that censure is inflicted. But I would also say respectfully and firmly that if the Government is responsible to this House, this House is responsible to the country. My right hon. friend has said that India has no representative in this House. I deny the accuracy of that allegation. The representatives of India in this House are not one or two individuals, not even the section of members who are thought to be experts on the one hand, or those members who have a profound, a deep, and a special interest in Indian affairs on the other. Every member of this House whether elected by an English, or by a Scotch, or by an Irish constitutency, is a member for India. All the interests of India—personal, political, commercial, financial, and social—are committed to the individual and collective responsibility of the House of Commons. I ask the House to discharge that gigantic trust uninfluenced by any selfish or party feeling, but with wisdom, and justice, and generosity. (Loud general cheers.)

Sir G. CHESNEY: I should wish to be allowed, as one who is particularly interested in India, very earnestly to bear my testimony to the powerful arguments of the Secretary of State, and to urge that this House will not take any steps in the interests of any party in England which would be calculated to have the injurious effect upon the people of India which the sort of decision adumbrated by the motion of the right hon. gentleman (Sir H. James) would have the effect of inflicting. Sir, the right hon. gentleman (the Secretary of State) has truly pointed out the injustice and the illogical nature of dealing out to the people of India high-handed measures which would not be inflicted on any self governing colony. It is sometimes said on behalf of any such action that whereas the people of the Colonies have their representative institutions and are really independent, India does not govern itself and has not free institutions, and that therefore Parliament has a more immediate right to interfere directly in Indian affairs. Sir, we know very well, and the people of this country understand very well, that they cannot venture—whatever their powers legally may be—to interfere in matters of tariff and revenue with the affairs of the Colonies, and if it be urged that they can do so in the case of India, this at least, Sir, may be pleaded, that if India is not self governing, India is entirely self supporting. India bears all the weight of its own defence, of its own administration. The loans raised by India are raised upon her own responsibility, and are not guaranteed by the Government of this country or by this Parliament. Therefore I think hon. members ought to see that it would be extremely unjust for Parliament, while having no responsibility of the expenditure of India, to dictate to the Government of India in what way the taxes of that country are to be levied and what their fiscal arrangements should be. And, Sir, I would also ask the attention of the House to this point, which has not been touched upon by the Secretary of State. It is this, that the sort of direct action and interference which has been suggested by the right hon. gentleman (Sir H. James) to-night is practically an entirely new departure. In former years Parliament did not interfere directly with Indian finance. I would remind the House that about 35 years ago when the finances of India were placed in a state of embarrassment owing the great expenses of the Mutiny and the loss of revenue that followed it, the revenues of India being then in a state of great embarrasment, the Government of India put a very heavy duty on almost every article imported into India. I think the duty was at one time as high as 20 per cent. Mr. Wilson, who held the position of secretary to the Treasury, was sent to India as Finance Minister, and he reduced these duties to 10 per cent., not because he questioned the right or propriety of the Indian Government to impose them, but because he found they were so excessive as to be destroying the import trade. But not a word of remonstrance with the Government of India was ever raised in this country. It was felt that in a great emergency, it was the duty of the Government of India to take whatever measures were necessary to restore the financial equilibrium. Those duties were gradually reduced to 7½ per cent., and afterwards to 5 per cent. In 1882 they were taken off altogether, not in deference to any definite instruction, or any specific declaration from this country, but because the improved condition of the finances of India permitted of their remission without the raising of any countervailing taxation. Now, an entirely different state of things has arisen, and nothing that has occurred in the past, prevents the Indian Government from raising these duties to meet a financial emergency. I would ask the House also, to bear in mind that the present difficulty has arisen almost entirely owing to the fall in silver, and not only has the action of the Government of this country prevented any re-adjustment or rehabilitation of silver, but they have also prevented the question from being even discussed in a rational and sympathetic way. The Home Government and Parliament are, therefore, under a great responsibility to the Government of India in this matter. The Secretary of State, Sir, has referred to the different degrees of reciprocity in practice in England and in India. A great cry is now raised by an English industry because a 5 per cent. duty is to be levied on a certain class of goods which had been specially exempted from the general tariff, applicable to all other imports. But we in England tax the commoner kinds of Indian tea to the extent of 100 per cent., and cigars, which could be purchased in India at 1s. per 1,000, pay a duty of something like 1,000 per cent. In the face of these facts can this country, with any sort of conscience or reason, complain if, in the interest of a shattered revenue, a duty of 5 per cent. is put upon a certain class of goods imported into India. We have been told, Sir, of the enormous importance of this 5 per cent. duty to Lancashire trade, but no branch of trade with India can flourish unless the people of that country are contented and prosperous. As the Secretary of State for India has said, there are latent forces in India ready at any moment to make themselves felt on the surface of society, and it is necessary that the Indian people should feel not only that they are governed justly, but that they are governed in their own interests. If we do not, then sooner or later, if a feeling of mistrust in the honesty of the English Government and its representatives in India should be suffered to arise, then assuredly we shall have gone a long way to break down the union which prevails between the two countries. I am sure I am not exaggerating the gravity of the case. Lastly, I would ask hon. gentlemen to consider that the hon. member for Bury has made out no case for any alternative action. He proposes a motion of rejection or of suspension, but what does he say is the alternative of these cotton duties? He disclaims all knowledge of any practicable measure to be substituted for them. I deeply regretted to hear the unworthy insinuation made by the right hon. gentleman against those whom he termed the Anglo-Indian officials. He gave the House to understand that these duties had been proposed by them in order to augment their own sustentation allowances and pensions. Sir, the high officials who have been instrumental in proposing these measures have no sort of advantage in the exchange compensation allowances, as they are called, which have been established solely in the interests of the poorer servants of the State, whose incomes, very moderate before, and not more than sufficient for decent maintenance, have been cut down one-half by the depreciation in the value of the rupee. It is, of course, open to anyone to call in question the ability, or the judgment, of the Indian public servants, but this is the first occasion on which their motives have been impugned, and it is greatly to be regretted that so improper an insinuation should have been made. I shall certainly oppose the right hon. gentleman's motion. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BARLOW: Having had a good many years' experience of the importation of goods into India, I naturally do not approach the subject with any predilection in favour of an import duty on cotton goods going into India. It is stated in a Blue Book that during the past twenty-five years the importation of British cotton into India has increased largely, and that the output of cotton in India has also increased largely. These are facts which no one acquainted with the matter will question. The increase in the importation of piece goods into India was much more rapid during the last ten years than it was during the ten years after the duty was abolished. The Indian industry extended more rapidly when it was protected than before. The Blue Book also shows that, not only has the Lancashire cotton trade increased in India, but it also shows that when there was no duty the manufacture of cotton goods had increased very considerably in India. Whilst the Chief Secretary for India alluded to the fact that India had some advantage in competing with Lancashire, he also asserted that she had many disadvantages. She had to pay heavily for machinery; but there is no doubt that the manufacture of textile fabrics in India is largely on the increase, and that is not confined to cotton goods, but also extends to manufactured jute goods. Now the Government has done right, I think, to recognise the fact that India has managed, in spite of the position of Lancashire, to get to itself the production of yarns under twenties against Lancashire, and I think the Government has been well advised in exempting from their taxation those coarser yarns, because I consider that the production of yarn has been wrested from Lancashire, not only for India, but for China and Japan. I have often been in Lancashire, but I cannot say that I have noticed the complacency with which—the right hon. gentleman the member for Bury, seems to assert—the Lancashire people regard that increased Indian production. Lancashire, I believe, is naturally and seriously alarmed at the increased production of the Indian mills; but they are, judging by the history of the past, able to hold their own, and fight their own cause. (Hear, hear.) There is an idea that the interests of Lancashire have been sacrificed to the interests of India, and that the cotton duty is a duty which has been imposed upon cotton goods solely. The duty was imposed upon other goods which had been imported into India some time before it was imposed upon Lancashire goods, many months before, and a special exemption was made in the case of cotton goods for the benefit of Lancashire. I do not believe that that exemption, if it is thoroughly understood throughout the country, will be at all popular. The principle which I believe ought to be applied to this question, is that there ought to be equality as between the cotton industry and other important industries in connection with the goods which are imported into India. I must admit that if the statutes were relaxed, which were imposed upon simple cotton goods manufactured in Lancashire, and without any counteracting excise duties, and not applied to other goods, I for one would oppose the tax most strenuously, as being unfair and unjust to Lancashire; but when other goods are taxed, I see no reason why Lancashire cotton goods should not be taxed too. I can also bear witness to the fact, that much as this matter is disliked in Lancashire, the action of the Government is, I believe, quite as much disliked with regard to other duties in India on lighter goods, protests against which I receive by every Indian mail that comes in, not from officials and natives, but from men in an independent position, who say that the English Government is sacrificing India for the benefit of Lancashire, and for the sake of the votes which Lancashire brings. The position must be one of great difficulty and delicacy to deal with, but my own impression is, looking into the matter carefully, that the Government in dealing with this matter, and bearing in mind that money was to be raised, are acting in a manner, which, taking all things into account, is the most equitable to all the different interests involved. I think they have dealt with it in a manner, which, by taxing both Indian producers and English producers, has been accepted by both sections of the community, and will cause both ultimately to desire that the tax may be removed as soon as is consistent with sound financial policy. I shall be glad when the finances of India are in such a satisfactory condition that it is possible to remove, not one tax, but both together. (Hear, hear.) But I think that we here have to regard this matter not primarily with regard to the interests of Lancashire: we must approach it from a national and Imperial standpoint. This House is committed, not only to the interests of Lancashire, important as these interests are, but also to those of our vast empire, including India with its 250 millions of people. If some few gentlemen who represent Lancashire are combining with gentlemen opposite to turn out the Government, will they, if they succeed, support this question? Does the Opposition intend to abolish these duties? Does the Opposition mean to make India, with its vast interests and population, a mere ball to be kicked about the floor of this House? As regards this financial policy, I am willing to recognise that they have great responsibilities with regard to her financial position: but I am not unwilling to thwart a policy which, if adopted, would permit India to exist merely for our own profit, and to be governed without reference to her own interests. It would be unworthy of the name which we bear as Englishmen and the traditions we have inherited from the men who formed our Empire. It is a policy which would meet with disaster, and one which the Government would never adopt and the country would never sanction. (Cheers.)

Mr. R. W. HANBURY: No one can echo more thoroughly than I do the feelings and sentiments of the right hon. gentleman expressed in the eloquent speech which he addressed to this House. Everything he has said points to the necessity of the most complete justice being done to India, and has my most cordial sympathy. Throughout the whole of this discussion, one fact has been emphasised, and that is that India is represented by every member in this House. I contend that it falls upon every member of this House, whether he represents Lancashire or not, not to lose sight of the interests of India. (Hear, hear.) It certainly does seem to me that of all the counties in England, Lancashire is the best able to take that view, because when we consider the enormous trade that Lancashire has with India, we see that Lancashire is more vitally interested in the peace and contentment and prosperity of India than any other county, and therefore I do not think it ought to be said for one moment that Lancashire has selfish interests in this question. I think this is a wider question than a mere Lancashire question. It raises some very important questions for the whole of England, because it is a very serious thing when our agriculture and trade are in their present condition—when agriculture is almost dying out in the country that the next greatest industry should be in any way crippled. (Hear, hear.) The cotton industry is almost confined to this particular county. If it was diffused throughout the country, and any serious harm came to it, those employed in it might find employment in other industries, but if Lancashire suffers there is no outlet outside that county for similar employment, and it would be a serious thing to have a whole county practically ruined. (Hear, hear.) I think that in this discussion the case of Lancashire has been put too low, while too much has been said about Lancashire's selfishness. (Hear, hear.) On the other hand there are the claims of India in this question. What is the contention we have heard on the other side of the House? The contention is that India has a perfect right with regard to her finances to consider her own interests alone. I give that an emphatic denial. I do not believe she has the right. I think that in these matters in a great Empire like this, the interest of the mother country is fairly entitled to consideration. (Hear, hear.) To take any other view than that is surely to take a view that is opposed to one of the strong tendencies of the day. That tendency is to come to some arrangement whereby trade between the mother country and the colonies should be increased. (Hear, hear.) Even if India was a self-governing colony there would be pretty much the same objections raised as there are now, because her finances are practically in the hands of this House. England is not responsible to anything like the same extent for the credit and finances of the self-governing colonies as she undoubtedly is for India. In the first place India would never be able to borrow on such easy terms as she does had she not England at her back. No doubt it is a startling thing to say that England after all is to a very great extent responsible for Indian finance, but we have, by the way, in which this House has constantly interfered with Indian affairs, made this House of Commons to a very great extent responsibe. And if India had a deficit which could not be fairly met by taxation, this House would have to come to her rescue. There is this broad distinction between India and the self-governing colonies. I say that India is not entitled to levy import and protective duties that we at home could not levy. (Hear, hear.) We only ask to give exactly the same terms to India in this respect, that we are perfectly willing to enforce upon ourselves. So much from a general point of view. There is one consideration that has not been presented to the House, and that is this. I ask myself ss a Lancashire member, how is it that this deficit comes about? My view of the case is this, that if this Imperial Parliament and the British Treasury did its duty to India there would be no deficit at all. As a Lancashire member I consider it thoroughly unjust that because England as a whole and the British Treasury do not take their fair share of the military charges, and as a consequence India has a deficit in her finances, the whole burden of that deficit should fall upon Lancashire. (Hear, hear.) Let me point out how in my opinion this arises. I have seen in some Lancashire papers suggestions that there ought to be a subsidy from the Imperial Parliament, to avoid the necessity of these import duties. I do not think that is a fair contention, and I cannot take that view for a moment. But I think that pretty much the same result is arrived at by looking at the subject in another way. In the first place I do object most strongly—if my argument is correct that Lancashire is made very largely responsible for filling up the deficit in the Indian Budget—I do object to Lancashire being made indirectly responsible for a good many of the fads that are thrust upon India. But that undoubtedly is the result. This House of Commons if it forces upon India peculiar ideas that are entirely out of consonance with Indian opinion, and which are certainly out of consonance with the oppinons of the majority of the Lancashire Members as well, does a most unjust thing. But this it undoubtedly does. Take for instance the Opium Commission. Why should India pay half of the cost of that commission? I say that if we adopt the principle that Lancashire is to be made responsible for Indian deficits we must keep a greater check upon the House of Commons' fads. (Hear, hear, from the Chancellor of the Exchequer.) I don't know whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer will agree with me in the next fad I am going to produce. There is no doubt whatever that the Cantonments Act is entirely against public opinion in India. We Lancashire Members are charged with fighting in the face of Indian opinion. Is not the Minister responsible for the Cantonments Act fighting in the face of Indian opinion? Does he not know that hardly a single voice is raised in the Indian Council in favour of that Act? What is going to be the cost to India to enforce the Cantonments Act? Sir George White tells us that if this Act is given full effect it will be doubtful indeed if our Indian Army will be able to carry on its work and that the large amount of money that is being spent on that army will be inadequate and that we shall have to add largely to the Indian forces. I say again is it right to satisfy a fad of that kind, is it right that the whole burden should fall upon Lancashire alone. I take another point, I think that reductions ought to take place in expenses of the Indian Office itself. The expenses of that office are out of all proportion to the work which it does. The India Office is quite out of the control of this House. The Commission which inquired into every other Department of the State was not allowed to look into the India Office. I should not have thought that the cost of that office would be anything like the cost of the Foreign Office, which has the conduct of the whole foreign affairs of this country nor as much as the cost of the Colonial Office, which deals with the whole of the Colonies. But what are the facts? While the Colonial Office costs only £40,000 and the Foreign Office £60,000, the India Office costs £120,000. I say, therefore, that at any rate £60,000 might be saved. I will take another point—a point which I have often raised in this House, and which I shall feel bound to raise again every time the War Office estimates come on—I mean the charges on the Indian army. The charges are grossly unjust, and if India were self-governing would never be imposed. What are these charges? India bears the whole of the charges for all the troops in India; she pays the whole of the passage of our troops out to India; she pays the whole of the passage of troops back again here to England, and for everything on board ship, medical expenses, and all the rest of it. Surely it would be thought that in paying all these expenses Indin had borne her full share of the cost? But there is actually an addition to these enormous charges. In the estimates of this year there is a sum of nearly £600,000 which India is called upon to pay for the training of troops in England itself. I say that is perfectly monstrous. (Hear, hear.) And if Indian troops are employed anywhere outside India, as they were in 1882 and 1885, it is India and not England which bears the cost. Then, again, when Indian troops came over to the opening of the Imperial

Institute it was India that paid. I say that when India is made responsible for her own troops inside and outside it does seem monstrous that in addition she should have to pay this large sum of £600,000 for drilling troops in England itself. (Hear, hear.) These are only a few charges. India's deficit is placed at a million and a-half, and here we have items, which come to nearly £800,000, which ought to be borne by the Imperial Parliament and not by India. I pass to one other point. While I agree with a great deal that was said by the Secretary for India, still in some respects I think the right hon. gentleman went on a false presumption altogether. Is he sure that these duties will not be protective? If he is not sure, then his case is gone. (Hear, hear.) I should like to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he thinks the principles of Free Trade are being fairly carried out, because I have here a remarkable statement made by him at the dinner of the Oldham Chamber of Commerce the other day in which he said that "in his opinion Mr. Balfour's speech the previous night was an extremely fair exposition of the question. He deeply regretted that it should have been necessary to impose import duties of any kind that were not in harmony with free trade." (Cheers.) They are protective duties and not in accordance with free trade. I shall be pleased to hear from my right hon. friend what he has to say upon this question. There can be no doubt whatever that these excise duties are so illogical that it will be impossible for them to last. These import duties remain, but the excise duties cannot last. Let me speak of some of the inconsistencies with regard to these countervailing duties. In the first place they are partial, being only countervailing duties in regard to cotton. The Secretary for India took great credit to himself for making no exemption with regard to Lancashire as to the import duties, but why has he made this exception with regard to Lancashire by these excise duties? There is no reason whatever why these excise duties if they are to be maintained should make exceptions in favour of Lancashire. Every other trade should pay countervailing duties. Then again I believe that the cost of collecting these excise duties will be almost as much as the amount they produce. Take another point. I have not heard anything as to any arrangement with the Indian native States. Has such an arrangement been made, and are these excise duties to be made in these States as well? If the mills in India have to pay excise duties they will be transferred to places where they will not have to pay such a duty. (Hear, hear.) I am not quite sure of my figures, but I think that the territory of the native States is something like 600,000 square miles, while the territory of England in British India is 800,000. Therefore the native States are nearly three-quarters as large as British India, and with regard to this enormous territory you have made actually no provision at all with regard to these excise duties. Things cannot remain in their present illogical condition. If you are going to have countervailing duties at all they should be extended so as to embrace say the worsted goods of Bradford. But if you are going to extend these excise duties generally you will be doing the greatest injustice to India, because you will be doing your best to crush industries upon which the prosperity of India so much depends. I pass to another point. I have argued already that these duties will at any rate soon become protective. The Secretary of State for India admits already that they are protective. I take another point. The right hon. gentleman said that these duties would fall, not upon the producer in Lancashire but on the consumer in India. India is one country and England is another. England is a very rich country and the average income is 20, or 30, or 40, or 50, or 60 times as large as the average income of India. India—that is our point—is a remarkably poor country; and so poor that the consumer cannot afford to pay the extra price. And for that reason we in Lancashire feel that it will fall upon the producer in Lancashire. In the case of an extremely poor country like India I think there can be but very little doubt whatever that these duties will fall on the producer, partly because in India the consumer is so exceptionally poor, and partly because he can afford to wait; whereas the producer in Lancashire has got his mill and his machinery running and he is obliged to sell for whatever price he can get. I know that we may be told that all these goods which India buys are to a great extent sold to the rich of India and not to the poor. I do not know how that can be the case when I consider the enormous amount of Lancashire goods that are sent to India, amounting to about £28,000,000 a year; I cannot be persuaded that they are mostly sold to the rich of India; I am told that there are very few rich in India and I think it will be found that the Lancashire goods are being sold not to the poorer but to the richer consumer in India. Then with regard to these excise duties; I am afraid that they will have another unfortunate effect on the English producer which I should like to point out very particularly, and it is this. In the first place what would be the result if the excise duty is put only on goods over twenties. Naturally, the result will be that more commoner and coarser goods will be consumed of twenties and under in India and they will thereby escape the excise duty. When the people find that the excise duty only touches the goods above twenties and does not touch those below, naturally there will be a much greater demand for twenties and under, and you lose your excise duty on goods above twenties. Then what about the Lancashire trade. Does it not also lose its trade? The result of these excise duties in India undoubtedly will be almost as disastrous to English trade as the import duties themselves, because the result will be that you will have a much greater demand for the non-excise paying goods under twenties. The result will be, I say, that the English trade, which is largely in goods above twenties, will to a large extent cease in this respect, and more than that, you will have been creating this large amount, this increased demand for goods under twenties in India, and the whole of that will be protected against England. I don't know why Lancashire has not her interests fairly guarded. It might be asked why she might not set to work and weave more goods of that class for export to India. The answer was that it would not be profitable to do so as long as no countervailing excise duty was imposed on the Indian-made article. The complaint of Lancashire is not so much against the Indian Government, which, after all, had a deficit to make good, as against the Government at home. India and Lancashire are united in maintaining that a number of the present Indian home charges ought to be borne by the Imperial treasury. These charges ought not to fall either on Lancashire alone, or upon India alone. I think it is monstrous that Lancashire should be expected to pay for the costly experiments of faddists, through whose action expenses have been incurred, which have helped to increase substantially the Indian deficit.

Capt. J. SINCLAIR: It is gratifying that there is no necessity to discuss on this occasion the general question of our Indian policy, the various points of criticism which the Indian government may be open to in other respects. Nor does it seem necessary to give much discussion even to this question of import duties: for it seems that we must at this present time accept and bear them however much we may dislike them in principle and however much we may hope that in the future, whether by increased prosperity, by the lessening of the public burdens in India, by the distribution of public burdens, or by economics in administrations, they may be done away with. This consideration considerably lessens the area of the subject we have to discuss; and lessens it to great advantage. I think one consideration must have occured to anyone who listened to the speech of the right hon. gentleman, the Secretary for India; and that is, that it is necessary to take a wide view even of this comparatively small subject of import duties. One observation we may recollect with advantage, is that the import duty was decided upon on the initiative of the Legislative Council. That brings us to a further consideration in which I think we must all acquiesce that, as the Legislative Council is the organ of British Authority in India, it would be a very serious thing to deal any blow at that authority, and it would not be an attempt in which we as Liberals could find anything congenial to our principles in other respects. I do not follow the hon. member for Preston in the remarks he made upon two points—as to manufactures in the native States, about which he will find full particulars in the Blue Book, and on the question of countervailing excise upon articles. My chief object in asking the permission of the House to make a few observations on this occasion is that I wish to mention an interest which has hitherto scarcely been mentioned in the discussion, but which is vitally concerned in this matter—the interests of the dyers of Scotland, who are large exporters to India and British Burma, of goods which will be greatly affected by this import duty, and by the New Tariff Act. The policy is this—that the import duty is to be levied upon these materials on all counts, whereas under the Tariff Act the excise duty is to be levied upon such counts as are above twenties. Now Scotch manufacturers, and especially those who work in my own county, acquiesce in the import duty. They recognise—and on their behalf I am glad to bear testimony to the fact—that it is necessary to take a wide and broad and liberal view of the necessities of the situation; but while they acquiesce in the imposition of an import duty, they want to draw the attention of the House and of my right hon. friend to the effect of the Excise duty upon their exports to India. It is maintained by the Secretary of State that of these lower counts which are not subject to the Excise duty, or against the exportation of which there is no countervailing Excise duty, the total imports into India had fallen to 8,500 lbs. weight last year in Bombay. I wish to remind the House, however, that there are very considerable exports of dyed yarns of these low counts to British Burma. The average exports to that country of these counts, indeed, has for the last four years been something approximating to four million pounds weight per annum; and at least half of this amount will, I understand, come under the import duty and will not be protected or will not be countervailed, if I may use the expression, by equivalent Excise duties upon Indian manufactures. In this part of the trade, therefore, there is direct competition on the part of our Scotch manufacturers with the trade in India. Twenty-ones made up as twenties, and dyed in India will be landed duty-free in Burma; whereas similar yarns dyed in this country will be subject to import duty there. There was the further point, that Indian yarns above twenties, which were subject to excise duty, were subject to this duty in their grey state, whereas British yarns were made liable to import duty in their dyed state. To sum up, the situation as it affected Scottish manufacturers was this: that the Indian dyer paid no duty on twenty-one's and under, and less than one-half the duty paid by the British dyer on yarns over twenty-one. Perhaps I may take this apportunity of thanking my right hon. friend, on behalf of those interested for whom I specially speak, for his courtesy in consenting to receive a deputation on this subject next week, and to discuss these points with them, and also for his courtesy with regard to the communications which have been sent to him by the Scotch manufacturers, through me. He has been good enough to repeat fully and explicitly the assurance already given that he intends on behalf of the Government to deprive these duties of all Protective character. That assurance, I am certain, has given great satisfaction to all who are so deeply interested in the trade as are those on whose behalf I speak; and I am sure that they will do everything that lies in their power to give my right hon. friend all the information which will enable him to form a full and correct estimate of the circumstances of the case. I assure him that all they ask for is no unfair advantage or preferential treatment—simply justice as between themselves and the Indian manufacturers.

Mr. T. SIDEBOTTOM: The system of Protection inaugurated by these duties ought, in my opinion, to be condemned alike by this House and by public opinion throughout the country, for it is difficult to determine whether it is not more injurious to the interests of this country than to India itself. I say system of Protection advisedly, because the right hon. gentleman in his able speech gave the whole case away when he said that the bulk of the yarns sent to India was consumed by hand looms. It is obviously impossible to collect the excise duties from hand looms, therefore what becomes of the argument as to its being a countervailing duty? (Hear, hear.) The amount of this duty is five per cent., and it undoubtedly increases the price of cotton goods throughout India and greatly handicaps English manufacturers, hampers our trade with India and fosters and encourages the rise of cotton mills in India to an undue and unfair extent. Some members may think five per cent. is not such a heavy duty and cannot make so much difference, but I must remind them that the charge against the English manufacturer is not that his profit is excessive. Many of them would be glad if they could ensure even a five per cent. profit. It may be said we don't hold India for the benefit of the Lancashire manufacturers, and that we should approach this question from an Indian point of view, but it seems to me that on that ground even these duties are thoroughly indefensible. We are told—the right hon. gentleman himself has told us—that the people of India are in favour of these duties; but who are the people of India? They do not consist exclusively of the Government officials we have heard of, and the shareholders of cotton mills. If it were possible to consult the great body of consumers in India, I venture to think they are far too acute and too much alive to their own interests to be in favour of anything of the kind. They are bound to see that this is a tax upon what constitutes their chief article of clothing. In one of Lord Salisbury's able despatches on this subject he said that this duty is maintained at the expense of the consumers, principally the poorer classes, against whom it tells with particular hardship. Those are wise words, and as true as wise. It is undoubtedly the duty of the British Government to do everything in their power to develop the material resources of India, but it surely cannot be their duty to tax the many for the benefit of the few, or to assist English and other capitalists in amassing enormous fortunes by developing cotton spinning and cotton manufacture in India to the ruin of manufacturers here. Although the poorer classes are very heavily taxed the rich landholders and the higher classes generally possess, many of them, fabulous wealth. An income tax or some other means of meeting the necessities of the Government might have been found without taking such a retrograde step as the re-imposition of these most obnoxious protective duties. Apart from their bearing on the direct interests of India, I think the effect of these duties on the great cotton trade of this country should be taken into account. We are at present in a dreadful state. The cotton trade is, in fact, in a state of partial collapse. Never before in its whole history was greater depression known, and it is greatly to be feared that the distress and want of employment, already sufficiently serious, will be greatly aggravated unless measures are speedily taken. Many mills are working at the present moment wholly for the sake of the operatives, and many concerns are unable to sell more than a quarter of their production. Under such circumstances these duties are of the most oppressive and onerous character. They amount to nearly half the wages that we pay to our weavers for weaving our cloth, and constitute a tax of more than half-a-crown a loom. (An hon. member: "Question.") I believe my statement is perfectly accurate. So far as our competition with the Indian manufacturers is concerned, we do not object to the natural advantages possessed by our Indian rivals: we do not object to their advantages in cheap labour and in the possession of markets near at hand; but we do object to have our trade taken from us by our own Government by the aid of protective duties. It is the inherent right of all the subjects of the Queen to trade freely in the British dominions. (An hon. member: "Canada.") It is well known that these duties have been imposed owing to the exigencies of the Indian Government, and it is also well known that India at the present moment is suffering from a great fall in exchange owing to the depreciation of the silver, but if that depreciation has been a source of loss to the Government of India, the loss to British manufacturers has been as great or greater, and it has for long constituted a very heavy and oppressive tax on our industry. It seems hard, therefore, that in consequence of this fall we must pay another tax in addition. We object entirely to the impost. We hear a great deal about the largeness of our exports to India, but the arguments founded upon the fact of our large exports are very fallacious, and the deductions and conclusions drawn are entirely erroneous. These heavy shipments which took place recently were, to a great extent, caused by the anticipation of these duties. In very desperation manufacturers sent goods to India, hoping that something might happen to enable the difficulty to be solved. I am told that the markets are now glutted, and I should not be discharging my duty if I did not impress on the Government that the condition of the trade is all the more serious in consequence. I hope the Government will give the subject careful consideration. We have more and more competition to encounter every year. I have faith in the energy of our race and the future of our country. (Hear, hear.) I believe we shall have a revival of our trade sooner or later, but, in order that we may hasten it, let us discard these miseralbe remnants of Protection, this policy of a bygone age. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. PHILIP STANHOPE: Speaking for one of the largest centres of the cotton industry (Burnley), I can say for my constituents that they are not animated in this matter by any unworthy jealousy or by any disregard for the interests of India as a whole. The people of Burnley have this peculiarity—that while one large section is engaged in weaving cloth, which happily goes all over the world, another large section is engaged in the manufacture of looms which are sent to those very Indian manufacturers who are the cause of the imposition of the import duty about which all this agitation has arisen. (Laughter.) I can say, therefore, that my constituents do not regard the matter from purely selfish standpoints. Indeed, I can go further, and say that the people of Lancashire as a whole are animated in their action by no selfish considerations. We have heard a great deal, in the course of recent debates in the House, of the selfish and sectional interests of the people of Lancashire. That same cry was raised fifty years ago when Lancashire led the way in the agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws, and as the people of Lancashire were then the foremost champions of Free Trade, they are to-day the foremost supporters of Free Trade. (Hear, hear.) The Secretary of State has made a powerful speech. If I venture now to enter upon a criticism of it, it is not by way of depreciating its merits, but of endeavouring to point out that he has missed some of the grounds on which this motion was made, and he does not meet the objections raised by the friends of this industry in Lancashire. The right hon. gentleman commenced with a cordial advocacy of the merits of the Anglo-Indian officials. I am not aware that the member for Bury made any attack on those officials, or that he said anything derogatory to Mr. Westland or any of those distinguished men who serve the State with such energy in India, and whose merits we all recognise. It cannot be denied that while a very competent, it is a highly-paid, and that in a sense it is a protected service; it could not be denied that when it had complaints to make it had an amount of representation in the Government of India which certainly the natives of India had not in a proportionate degree. We know that this service has sums to remit to England and that its members complain of the depreciation in the value of the rupee. But when we find that one of the principal features of the Indian Budget is to make up the loss in the value of the rupee for superannuation and Home Charges to the Anglo-Indian service in India, when we know that that amount which is to be added to the Indian Budget is to be made up by a charge like the import duties on cotton goods, I think, Sir, we have a right to protect the great industry in question and protest against our being made the victims of that necessity, and to say that while we recognise the merits of the Anglo-Indian service it is not entirely from us that the money shall be made up. The Secretary of State entered at great length into what he was pleased to call "the financial necessities of India." But not once, either directly or indirectly, did the right hon. gentlemen dispute the demands of the Indian Government for additional revenue, which everyone knows is solely needed in order to make up the loss entailed by the officials of that Government owing to the depreciation in the rupee, and not once did the right hon. gentleman suggest the possibility of meeting the deficit by a reduction in expenditure, but throughout his entire speech insisted absolutely in the production by some sort of taxation of this additional revenue required by the Indian Government. I believe, and in that belief I am surported by a large section of Indian opinion, that there are great possibilities of economy in both the military and civil charges of India. (Hear, hear.) But, Sir, we are told that public opinion in India is entirely in favour of those duties. I should like to know how the right hon. gentleman arrived at his knowledge of the public opinion in India. There are two branches of public opinion in India. There is the public opinion which is purely official, which, it would seem, has alone guided the right hon. gentleman in the judgment at which he has arrived. But there is another public opinion which is solely interested in the welfare of the people of India, and which insists that if due economy were exercised in the public charges of India, justice will be done to the natives of India, and at the same time Indian finance will be settled on a satisfactory basis, and without recourse to duties upon articles of primary necessity to the poorer classes in India. (Hear, hear.) The right hon. gentleman quoted the opinion of Lord Lansdowne. But he forgot to give the House the opinion of one of his most eminent colleagues in the Government, Lord Kimberley, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, who, when approached only last year by a deputation of the Blackburn Chamber of Commerce, said: "There is only one considerable source of revenue, and I mention it with a thrill of horror—import duties." (Laughter). "I need hardly say that that is not within our contemplation. I do not suppose that anybody would attribute to me a heresy of that kind, and I only mention it for the purpose of dismissing it." (Laughter.) I do not know whether the noble lord has been converted by the Secretary of State for India to views which only last year he looked upon as heresy; but, at all events, the people of Lancashire have reason to complain that the Government of which the noble lord was a distinguished member should, without any sufficient justification for their change of position, sanction the imposition of import duties, which, in the opinion of the noble lord, was a serious departure from ancient Liberal traditions. (Hear, hear.) I am glad to hear that the right hon. gentleman is prepared to reconsider the arrangement with regard to the countervailing duties; but though I accept it as a good augury for the future, I do not think it will justify the Government in the new departure they have made. Every import duty in India, of whatever nature, must be a tax on the consumers of India; and it should be remembered that cotton cloth is one of the primary necessities of the natives of India. The right hon. gentleman seemed to assume that it is only a small question of the number of counts, and that if he changed the particular count to 15 or 25, as the case might be, it would meet the difficulties of the situation. But it would do nothing of the sort. What the right hon. gentleman has done is to authorise an excise duty upon yarn alone, and it is because it is on yarn alone that the opponents of the policy said that no matter what the right hon. gentleman might do in regard to the change of count, the duty would still act as a protective duty. I have shown that Lancashire has some right to have her case heard. Twenty years ago the whole country was agitated to obtain a repeal of these duties; in 1879 a resolution was passed by the House of Commons, condemning the duties as unjust to the Indian consumer; and it is not to be supposed that, by small concessions of detail, Lancashire will now be brought to consent to the reimposition of the duties. I accept with great satisfaction such concessions as the right hon. gentleman has made, but if the right hon. member for Bury goes to a division, I shall vote with him to record my protest against these duties. (Hear, hear.)

Sir J. LEIGH: Lancashire is suffering very much from depression at the present time, and we do think that a more inopportune occasion could not have been chosen for disturbing our trade than the present one. I quite agree with the last speaker that Lancashire will never rest as long as these import duties remain. But I must say that the speech of the Secretary of State for India—particularly that portion of it in which he undertook to consider any suggestion for correcting the protective character of the duties—commends itself very much to my judgment. I think, Sir, that the members for Lancashire ought now to turn their attention to bringing before the Secretary of State for India all the suggestions they can for removing Protection from these duties. I think the mover of this motion proved conclusively that under the present proposals the Indian weaver will be protected to a considerable extent, and also that if, owing to the cheapness of American cottons, the Lancashire spinners found themselves able to compete in coarser counts India, with these duties, would prevent that competition. I think, Sir, we shall be doing our duty to our constituents if we turn our attention to bringing all the pressure we can to bear upon the Secretary of State for India to remove every element of Protection from these duties. I regret very much that the state of trade in Lancashire is as bad as it it, and we must leave no stone unturned in any direction; and particularly must we see that in such a market as India we have a fair field. I shall not trespass further upon the time of the House than to say how gratified I am for what we consider is a change. If it is not a change, it is more than I expected from the Secretary of State for India. Had it not been for that concession I should have felt it my duty to vote in favour of the motion. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BECKETT: I do not think that anybody can doubt that the member for Bury was right to raise this discussion in the House. Least of all can the Government complain, because the motion has afforded them an opportunity of explaining their policy in a manner which must carry conviction to every unprejudiced and patriotic mind. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman proposes to divide the House on this occasion, but I am sure I should think it a mistake if he does so, for I cannot see the justification for attempting to turn out the Government on this occasion. None of those who spoke in favour of the motion seemed to face the difficulty, which is that there is a deficit which must be met, and which must be met immediately.

That difficulty must be met by an increased revenue, and no gentleman has another way of increasing the revenue except by those duties. That being so, it seems to me that those who advocate this motion have no good cause to offer unless they can.substitute any exchange for that which they condemn. The right hon. gentleman said the voice of Lancashire had never been heard on this question at all. But it would be a strange thing if the voice of Lancashire had not been heard, for Lancashire had never been backward in making its voice heard upon any particular occasion. I think that the voice of Lancashire has been heard, and heard very effectively. Many members of this House have endeavoured to vindicate Lancashire from selfishness. If Lancashire is not actuated by selfish motives, by what motives is it actuated? Naturally Lancashire looked after her own interest. But the Government are bound to consider the interests of India quite as much as the interests of Lancashire—(hear, hear)—and in this matter it seems to me Lancashire has undoubtedly been treated with very great consideration, that every attention has been paid to her wishes. These duties upon cotton have not been imposed until they were an actual necessity, it is the very last source of revenue to be touched. The cotton trade has long been enjoying special exemption, and I cannot see on what ground Lancashire can claim to be exempted further. (Hear, hear.) The interests of Lancashire have been safeguarded in other ways by the imposition of new countervailing excise duties which the Secretary of State for India has explained, and that duty is levied at a higher rate than is usual in such a case; also, it seems to me, that if you are entitled to make a demand for the free entry of manufactures into India, India is entitled to free imports into England. (Hear, hear.) How can the opponents of cotton duties in India defend the imposition of tea duties in England. (Hear, hear.) They contend that we are taxing Lancashire and England for the sake of India, and India might as reasonably contend that she was being taxed for the benefit of England. That import duties are an evil cannot be denied, but are they a necessary evil? The right hon. gentleman the member for Bury made a serio-comic suggestion that a graduated duty should be imposed, and the member for Stalybridge said the rich men in India were taxed at a lower rate than the rich men elsewhere. Then the hon. member for Bury said that this duty came to be imposed in consequence of the continuous fall in the value of silver, and hon. members, he said, ought to know the consequences of our vicious financial position: but it is not enough to say that it is caused by a fall of silver unless you are prepared to adopt some measures to protect silver from falling still further. (Hear, hear.) You are in a difficulty because you cannot get other countries to go with you, or to adopt your favourite remedy of bimetallism. Unquestionably this question has been started by bimetallists, and that is why I, and others who think with me, view it with suspicion. If it is caused by the fall in the exchange it must work both ways. It acted as a bounty to manufacturers of cotton in India, and it is difficult to say whether England or India has lost or gained most by the fall in the value of silver. It is asked why we should deny the Indians the right exercised by our self-governing colonies. The very fact that India is not represented in this House ought to make every member careful to look after her interests and give weight and and authority to the opinions expressed by Indians. The member for Preston said an outcry would be raised if a colony was to impose a duty of that kind. When Mr. Rhodes proposed a 12½ per cent. duty all over Africa he received the enthusiastic support of Lancashire. (Hear, hear.) It seems to me that the attitude of the Opposition to attempt to turn out the Government on this question is a somewhat unfortunate one. (Opposition cries of "No.") Then I suppose you are not going to vote on this subject. If you do vote it will be a vote to turn out the Government, and if we have to choose between the solvency of India on the one hand and a slight and temporary reduction of profits in Lancashire I should not hesitate which course I should take. In supporting this matter we are taking a sound view of our Imperial interests and duties, and I say it will be an ill-omened day if the Unionist party were to defeat the Government on an issue on which the welfare of India depends so largely. (Cheers.)

Mr. Whiteley: I wish to deal with the question as a Lancashire manufacturer, and to ask you to judge by the effect that these import duties have on one branch what the general effect will be? I wishto impress upon this House the importance of this matter to Lancashire, it is a matter far-reaching and the gravity of which cannot be exaggerated. Those who put on those duties have struck Lancashire a very cruel blow. We vainly imagined that with a Liberal Government in power the doctrine of Free Trade would have been upheld—the doctrine so much belauded by the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other night. (Hear, hear.) In that expectation we have been fortified and justified in declarations of ministers during the past twelve months. It is very difficult to reconcile the policy and acts of the Government with the last resolution on the subject that is recorded in the books of the House of Commons. That resolution is a broad and comprehensive one, and it is to this effect: "That the duties on cotton goods are unjust alike to the consumer and producer, and ought to be repealed." The Secretary of State for India says these duties are not protective, and that the principles of Free Trade have not been violated. He seems to have a curious political arithmetic of his own: One duty equals Protection, but two duties, in his estimation and in that of the Liberal Government, are Free Trade. (Laughter.) We are often taunted in Lancashire with the question as to how it was we never discovered the enormity and wickedness of the import duties until our own manufacturers were touched. (Hear, hear.) There are various answers to that question. Lancashire is not the custodian or the guardian of the whole interests of the trading communities of this country, and furthermore we venture to argue that there is no comparison and that no analogy can be drawn on the question of the import duties on cotton goods and other products entering India, for this reason, that in the cotton industry there is great competition between India and England which does not exist in other branches of trade, and further that the export of cotton goods from this country is so large and bulks so overwhelmingly in the total exports from the British Isles that it exceeds the balance of all others. Take the Board of Trade returns for 1894. I find that the total amount of British exports in 1893 was £28,776,000, of which cotton yarns and goods amount to £17,864,000, or 62 per cent. In none of the other branches of trade is there any competition between this country and India, but with this trade there is very great and growing competition between this country and India. The hon. member for Bury pointed out that at the present time in India there were over three millions of spindles, whereas ten years ago there were only 1,600,000. The increase in spindles has been over 100 per cent., and of looms 73 per cent., whilst the increase in Great Britain during that time has been only 5 per cent.; on the continent 19 per cent.; and in the United States 20 per cent. This proves to demonstration that the cotton trade in India is a thriving and a progressive industry, whilst at the present time in Lancashire, taking the whole of the limited liability companies in the south of the county, the position of them is a retrogressive and a declining one. I may say also that we attribute the action to meet this deficit in India last year to the effect of the representations of the Bombay millowners. This great question between Lancashire and India has been sprung upon us because pressure has been brought to bear upon the authorities in India to impose these duties, and cause a wall of protection to be built around the Indian industry which it is impossible for Lancashire to get over. (Hear, hear.) If I cannot prove my contention to the satisfaction of the right hon. gentleman, I will almost go so far as to say that I will resign my seat in the House. (Laughter, and a voice, "No, don't do that.") I admit that it would be a misfortune if I did. (Renewed laughter.) I venture to say that up to the twenties protection to the Indian industry is absolute. In the able report of Sir J. Westland which is in our hands, and which was quoted bythe right hon. gentleman, these significant words occur, "It will obviously never pay Manchester to use America cotton at 4d. per lb. in making a class of goods which every Indian producer can make as well with cotton that costs 3d. per lb." On that text we base the whole of our contention. If this is true, then the converse is true. (Hear, hear.) At the present time, with American cotton at 3d. per lb., it would pay the Indian millowners to import American cotton rather than use Surat, or other Indian cotton. At the present price it would also be open for any Lancashire manufacturer to compete upon equal terms. But we cannot do it. I have mills and I cannot do it. And for this reason, that around this Indian business the right hon. gentleman has placed a wall of protection. I venture to say that so long as the 5 per cent. duty is placed upon twenties and under, so long is it absolutely out of the power of the Lancashire manufacturers of cotton goods to compete with India. That is an absolute fact. Neither the right hon. gentleman, nor the whole of the Ministry, nor the whole bench of Bishops were they in this House—(Laughter)—could deny it. Next, I say that over 20s. instead of the protection being absolute it is partial. That I can prove likewise. The House will understand this, the yarn value of cloth is only 60 per cent of the total value. Now, in India, the cotton manufacturer is taxed upon the yarn value, while goods sent from here to India are taxed upon the full value, so that there is a difference in favour of Indian manufacturers of 2 per cent. I have proved under 20s. that the protection is absolute and that over 20s. it is partial, now I will deal with the question as a whole. I have here an extract from a leading newspaper the *Caclutta Statesman*, which in combating the opinion of a Mr. Tata that serious injury was being done to the Indian cotton trade, says: "To a large extent the diminished consumption of goods in the dutiable class, that is of goods over twenties will be counterbalanced by an increase of goods under twenties. In other words it will mean merely a transfer of the demand from one class of goods to another, a change to which the majority of mills will probably be able easily to adapt themselves." That shows that the effect of these duties will be to switch off the demand for English goods and create a demand for Indian goods. I venture to say that the Secretary for India would have found out a great many of the difficulties of the case if he had only consulted Lancashire manufacturers. (Hear, hear.) But he has not done so. Indeed, I believe that the only representative he has consulted upon the matter belongs to the other side, namely, Sir James Westland. Sir James appears to me to have been very receptive of the Bombay doctrine. I should have liked to call attention to some very remarkable statements in Sir James Westland's report, but as time is so very short I will not do so now. The right hon. gentleman said that in India the richer classes were accustomed to use the finer class of cloth, while the lower classes used cloth of poor description. I have been in India and my experience is different. I think that as a rule the Hindu uses a finer quality of cloth for his turban or headgear, a medium quality to place around his loins, and, in all probability, the coarser kind he uses in his own home. Now, Sir, it is urged that the voice of India is in favour of these duties, and the Secretary of State has made that a very strong point. But how has the voice of India shown itself. If that voice had been displayed by the vote of a public elective assembly similar to the House of Commons, then we could have taken it that the voice of India was in favour of these duties, but it has not been so. What do public assemblies do when they want to raise money to meet deficits? Do they not levy taxes upon the rich? In India, during the past few years, the income tax has been reduced by 35 per cent., and incomes ranging from 200 to 500 rupees have been exempted. I venture to quote here a few words from Sir John Strachey the late Finance Minister in India regarding taxation. He says: "The tendency of the India authorities is rather by indirect taxation to lay their burdens upon the poor than by direct taxation to obtain their supplies from the rich." These are the words of a very great authority. "There is no country where the taxes upon incomes is more just than in India, but there has been much difficulty in obtaining it, because it has been opposed by the richest and most powerful class who alone can make their views heard. The official class, in the absence of direct taxation, contribute almost nothing. The mercantile and professional classes have greatly benefitted from our Government, more so than any other class of the community, but they have paid almost nothing towards the support of the country except when direct taxation has been imposed upon them."

Mr. H. H FOWLER: What is the date of that Report?

Mr. WHITELEY: 1888. I venture to make these further observations. The income tax has been reduced by 35 per cent. in India in the last few years. There is a tax upon all incomes over 500 rupees. Now, let me take the Land Tax. That tax is only one-fifth of the letting value of the land, and only one-twenty-fourth of the total product of the land. I ask agricultural members how they would appreciate such a situation as that? They have no tobacco duties in India, and their excise duties are considerably lower than ours. I am decidedly of the opinion of Sir Charles Bernard and Hon. Griffith Evans, that not only are death duties possible in India, but that they are very desirable, and would bring in a large additional revenue which now escapes taxation. Well, Sir, to pass on. As a rule, in this country when additional revenue is wanted the Chancellor of the Exchequer looks about for the most prosperous industries, and taxes them. But in India it is just the reverse. They look about, and in this case they take the cotton industry, and they protect it. We are not fighting in this case for ourselves; we are not struggling for our own pockets; we are not working only for our own interest and our own advantage; but on behalf of the millions of Lancashire operatives. A leader of them only the other day said to me that if these import duties remained upon cotton goods entering India they would either have to be content to receive less work or less wages. What is the condition of this industry? At the present time there are 35,000 looms standing idle, and in many districts mayors and philanthropic bodies are distributing bread and free meals to prevent the populace from starving. That is the condition of Lancashire at the present time, and it is a most unfortunate condition of affairs. (Hear, hear.) The Government has lately opened an inquiry into the question of how to administer relief to the unemployed. The unemployed in Lancashire do not want relief; they want work; and what we want is the opening of markets for our goods in all portions of the world. (Hear, hear.) We do not want the Government by their actions to restrict and to strangle those very markets which we enjoy. No district or country is more interested in the prosperity of India than Lancashire. The welfare of India is indissolubly bound up with that of Lancashire, and we shall be adopting a suicidal policy if we do, or attempt to do, anything that would injure permanently India's position. But we cannot favour Protection. The feeling of grievance and injury in Lancashire will undoubtedly rankle for a long time to come. We shall continue to agitate against these import duties, in season and out of season, until they are removed. (Hear, hear.) We have no wish to be unreasonable: we are only looking upon the interests of the operatives. (Hear, hear.) We urge that the duties should be equalised and assimilated, and that India should be taxed in exactly the same manner as Lancashire. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. GOSCHEN: The first remark that I have to make to the House is this. The few observations with which I will trouble them I speak in my individual capacity, and I do not wish to pledge a single member who sits in any quarter of the House to assent to the views I hold. I deeply regret in the matter—the very great matter—that is before us that we are deprived of the presence of my right hon. friend the member for Manchester, whose views on this matter, which he expressed with great ability and great moderation at Manchester not very long ago. I hoped he would have been able to place before the House with that commanding power he always displays. (Hear, hear.) I wish to emphasize the fact that I am simply speaking for myself; but I msut say, on the other hand, that I am speaking for myself with very strong conviction indeed. Well, Sir, it is much to be regretted that the course of Indian financial legislation should have brought us to this point. We see on one side very decided opinion in India, and on the other side very decided opinion in Lancashire. We have on the one side India in financial distress seeking to make both ends meet, believing that there are very few other sources of taxation left to her, and very jealous as to the manner in which this assembly will conduct her interests; and on the other side we see an industry in Lancashire depressed—(hear)—finding it difficult to hold its own at the present moment, and entitled to the greatest sympathy on the part of this House. (Hear, hear.) My right hon. friend the member for Bury has not only justified, but I think has proved his loyalty to his constituents in bringing this matter before the House, and though there are differences of opinion on both sides of the House, though I know amongst hon. members opposite there are some who condemn the Government while there are others who will support it, we find the same situation on this side of the House. Nevertheless, it is best that this matter should be argued out on the floor of the House, and that neither in Lancashire nor in India should there be any misapprehension as to the spirit in which we approach this question. In what spirit do we approach it? For my own part, I felt deeply the appeal which was made to us by the Secretary of State for India when he reminded us that we are not only the representatives of our own constituencies, but that this House is the trustee for that great empire of India—(cheers)—for the prosperity of which we shall be held responsible—a responsibility which, up to this time, I hope we have discharged in the eyes of the world with disinterestedness, and it would be a thousand pities if on some question of importance—but still not one of paramount importance—we should give the impression either to our Indian fellow-subjects or to the world that those principles of disinterestedness which have been at the foundation of our rule in India are no longer to be the guiding principles of the Government of this country. (Hear, hear.) I know how a question of this kind would be decided by other countries; there are some countries who, when they are brought face to face with a question which interests their fellow-subjects at home and their colonists abroad, would decide very quickly on the selfish course. The Secretary of State for India has quoted from the debate that took place in the Lords, and at which, as he said, there spoke ex-Viceroys of India, ex-Secretaries of State for India, and Lord Roberts who was throughly competent to judge of Indian matters, and he produced evidence which, had he not produced it, it would have been my duty to place before the House, that questions of this kind deeply interested the masses of India, and that these feelings cannot be brushed aside by any statements that this is an agitation got up simply by a limited class in India. The right hon. gentleman the member for Bury stated the case with the greatest possible moderation, but I admit that I regret one passage of his speech, I think based on some observations which I myself had seen in a pamphlet which has been circulated, to the effect that it was the Anglo-Indian feeling in India which was hostile to Lancashire. The pamphlet went a little further—it seemed to convey the impression that those men in India upon whose capacity, and upon whose impartiality and honesty our rule depends, had either been deceived or cajoled, or influenced by a small class of the Bombay millowners. I should be sorry that this House should feel that a charge like that should lie against those to whom we confide the interests of our fellow subjects. We have to show to the world that the men we send to govern India are straightforward men. (Hear, hear.) We try to send to India from this country the best administrators we can select, men who are superior to prejudice, and who will have a judgment of their own. (Cheers.) Yet a doubt has been thrown upon a class but for whom we should not be able to hold India. (Cheers.) We hold India just because we send out our best men to govern her. I am not one of those who believe that you can give European institutions to India—(hear, hear)—such assembles answer here. (Hear, hear.) I do not believe the Indian mind is constituted like ours, and hon. members opposite might imagine that I and others who think with me are belated in our views as to how India should be governed. But in proportion as I hold that India is not fit for such representative institutions I feel strongly that we are bound in duty to listen to the voice of the Indian people on questions affecting their interests. (Hear, hear.) We have on the one side powerful representations which deserve the most respectful consideration; and on the other hand we have representations from India. How ought we to treat the representations from India? Surely not simply as those of officials? In a question of this kind the voice of India must be heard. We cannot do otherwise in this House than listen carefully to those whom we send to that country with the very object of representing Indian opinion and interests to us, and we ought to extend to their advice the greatest respect. (Hear, hear.) The Council of India are against the exemption of these cotton duties, and we cannot altogether push aside their advice, because we have constituted that Council in order to be guided by them. The Secretary of State for India has said that he is bound to look mainly after the interests of India, and that he has also considered the interests of Lancashire. But it is not only the Secretary of State for India who is responsible; the whole Cabinet are responsible—(cheers)—for they might have overruled or attempted to overrule the right hon. gentleman if they thought that the question had not been sufficiently considered. There are two aspects in which this question might be regarded. In one respect it is one of the largest questions that can be brought before this House, and in another respect it may be shown to be a small question. The large question is the effect which an adverse vote of this House might have. (Cheers.) One expression has been used by the Secretary of State for India to-night which I do not think he was entitled to use unless he was deeply convinced that he ought to use it. He spoke of danger. (Hear, hear.) It was a very serious thing for the right hon. gentleman to say that the adoption of a particular course towards India—a course which many of the the right hon. gentleman's own party are prepared to support—would involve danger to that Empire, and it is a statement which cannot be ignored. (Hear, hear.) I am not at all sure but that the speeches made by Lord Lansdowne, Lord Northbrook and Lord Roberts—I do not say Lord Kimberley because he is a colleague of the right hon. gentleman—are not of a character to run counter to that declaration. It is not, therefore, a question of confidence in the Government, or a question of party. (Hear.) When we are told that any particular course involves danger to India, danger to Lancashire and its industries, danger to every industry in this country, danger to our power, we should sink every consideration of party, every consideration of particular interests, and should range ourselves boldly on the side of the Executive Government. (Cheers.) I have placed before the House frankly the larger aspects of the question. I will take now the smaller aspects. What is the exact point of my right hon. friend the member for Bury? What is it we are to vote against, if an opportunity is to be given us of voting against any particular proposition? Is it against the imposition of these duties at all? Or is it against the particular form with which the Government have arranged these excise duties? I ask my right hon. friend to give his particular attention to these questions. Does he say that the Government, in arranging these excise duties on an unsatisfactory basis, have established a protective system, although they are strongly committed against any such system? (Hear, hear.) Is that the main grievance of hon. members for Manchester? Let us be perfectly clear on this point. (Hear.) It is one thing to condemn import duties altogether; it is a second thing to condemn particularly the import duties on cotton, and it is a third thing not to condemn the import cotton duties alone, but to condemn them because they are imperfectly rectified by the system which the right hon. gentleman has introduced. I know that many of my hon. friends consider that the right hon. gentleman, notwithstanding the able speech he has made, has inadequately satisfied them with regard to that particular point. (Hear.) There are questions of detail connected with yarns and other points on which it is felt that the excise duty which he has established does not meet the case. Then what ought to be done? There ought to be a conference of all those who are interested so as to ensure the removal of these difficulties. (Cheers.) Are such great influences—such national powers I might say—as Lancashire and India to be put in a position of antagonism because they cannot agree as to the details of a tariff? This question ought to be dealt with in such a manner by the right hon. gentleman as will make it absolutely clear to the representatives of Manchester that he has carried out the policy to which his Government is deeply pledged, and to which he is equally pledged, viz., that there shall be no protective influence whatever in these duties. I feel this strongly, and I am not sure many hon. members do not also feel the same, that there has not been sufficient co-operation between Indian finance and English finance in the past. I might have been tempted on an occasion such as this, if the motion had been cast in a different direction, to say that we are entitled to ask from the Government that they should never have brought us to this present position of antagonism between Lancashire and India. (Hear.) The right hon. gentleman has had a good many mouths in which to deal with this question, and he must have known the feeling there was in Lancashire upon it. (Hear.) I cannot deny the courage of the right hon. gentleman: I think he has taken a very courageous view. But what he has not done is this: he has not brought the contending parties sufficiently together. (Hear, hear.) Now I should have wished that even at this last moment it had been found possible to effect, I will not say a compromise, but something in the nature of an armistice, for the sake of negotiations which should be carried on. (Cheers.) Is it really beyond the limits of the statesmanship of India and of this country to find any alternative for these import duties? Should it not be possible to deal otherwise with Indian finance than to be compelled to create and continue this antagonism which we all so very much regret? Whatever may be the result of this division to-night, whether the Government succeed, or whether they do not succeed, I think that this debate ought to be followed by an endeavour on the part of the Government to see whether they cannot bring Indian opinion and Manchester opinion closer together than they are at the present moment? (Hear, hear.) The difficulty after all is merely one of tariff and surely that being so there need be no trouble in bringing the parties together. (Hear, hear.) But what is to be the effect of the present vote? What is the meaning of the present vote? If it were simply this that the Government excise is unsatisfactory and ought to be remedied, I think I should vote with my right hon. friend the member Bury in order to bring them to a better understanding of their position. (Hear, hear.) But I I look upon it that this vote is not simply a vote as to the tariff. (Hear, hear.) We must look to the effect on India—(hear, hear)—when the decision of to-night has been telegraphed there. If we were to treat this in the direction of simply voting against the Government because we think that the excise is imperfect. I humbly think, myself speaking from my own point of view that such a vote would be misinterpreted in India. (Hear, hear.) I cannot, I ought not, as representative for India, as well as for St. George's, Hanover Square, run the risk of having my vote so misinterpreted. (Hear, hear.) I know that India feels strongly that indeed there is an overwhelming feeling on this point, and under these circumstances I cannot think I should be doing my duty if I gave a silent vote on this question. Every man in every part of the House will do what he considers to be his duty on this occasion. (Hear.) The Government will do wrong if they look upon this simply as a vote regarding their own conduct and administration. They will do wrong if they take advantage of the feeling which those experience who think so much of the sentiments of India if they construe it as an expression of confidence in themselves. (Hear, hear.) I care not how my vote is interpreted one way or the other, as regards party or individuals. What I want is that India should thoroughly understand that in this House on both sides there is a determination that Indian feeling should be considered as much as the feeling of any part of the country. (Cheers.)

The **Chancellor of the Exchequer**: I should have been disposed to rise later had it not been for the gravity of the speech of the right hon. gentleman. I hope there will never be wanting in this country men responsible for the prosperity of this great Empire, of which India perhaps forms the greatest part, who will be wanting in courage to take that line which in their deepest conviction is necessary for the security of both. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman deserves all credit, I think, for the language that he has used, and he may depend upon it that he shall not hear from me a word which will in any respect prevent that reconciliation of the great interests of this country and of India, of which he has expressed himself so ardently desirous. I must be permitted to claim also for Her Majesty's Government that it is in that spirit that we have acted. (Hear.) Sometimes in the heat of party debate it has been contended that the Government are actuated only by electioneering designs, that their object is to catch votes and to secure their political and party position. But do you think that when the Cabinet came to a decision upon this momentous question they were actuated by any such considerations? Do you think that they were not fully aware of the difficulties which they would create for themselves in Lancashire? Do you think they did not know that they were placing many of their own supporters in a very difficult position; that they were risking many votes which might be of importance to them at the moment. (Cheers.) But, Sir, this I will say, that the Government never hesitated for one single moment in taking that decision which they believed was necessary in the interests of the people of India, whatever effect that decision might have upon their own party or political future. (Cheers.) That I am entitled to say, and further, I will add, that in that respect the Government have acted in the same spirit as the right hon gentleman who has just addressed us. (Hear, hear.) I am not disposed myself to go at any length into this subject, or to occupy the time of the House on a matter which has been so ably, I was going to say, so splendidly, dealt with by the Secretary for India, who has shown how worthy he is to hold one of the noblest positions which can be held by an English statesman. (Cheers.) It is not necessary that I should say anything upon that point. I have only to repeat to the right hon. gentleman what my right hon. friend himself has said. He has stated how willing he is to go into considerations which might remove the sense of injustice, if it exists as to the protective operation of these duties. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman has invited that consideration: he has said that he is perfectly ready, and, indeed, anxious, to receive from the representatives of Lancashire their views upon this subject and to compare it with the relative information he may receive from India upon that head. I am happy to think that the feeling in Lancashire which my right hon. friend, the member for Bury, has described as being so bitter—as one that will never rest and which will always continue in a spirit of hostility on this question does not prevail in all quarters there. If it does there must have been a great falling off in the tone of the county. (Hear.) I hold in my hand a speech much worthier of Lancashire than that which we have heard from the member for Bury. That speech was one made by a man well known and highly respected in Lancashire; it was made at the annual meeting of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, it was made by the President of that Chamber, sir, F. Forbes Adams, a man who has quite as much knowledge of Lancashire as my right hon. friend; who does not speak on instructions upon this subject, but who speaks from the point of view of practical experience? What does the President of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, dealing with this matter, say? He says he considers that there has been very great exaggeration as regards the effect these duties will have upon the trade and commerce of Lancashire. I have his exact words here, and I wish to be careful to use thom. He says: "There is no doubt that a large amount of business has been done with India during the past twelve months; the shipments were still large, even though there has been a recent decline in exchange. . . . I have seen in the newspapers what I regard as very exaggerated statements as to the effect of these duties upon the Lancashire trade." And then he goes on to say in reference to the points on which my right hon. friend calls for continued agitation in Lancashire—and I beg the attention of the House to these words, for they are worthy of the President of the Chamber of Commerce: "He saw it stated that there was to be a continuous agitation against these duties, and that they objected to them *in toto*. He did not pretend to think that any word he could say would have any influence outside, but if it had influence there was no word he could use which would be strong enough to express his desire to persuade those who were responsible for the agitation to cease. It was not worthy of the great fame of Lancashire, of its self-reliance, its stateliness, its stability, its solidness, or its record. What was the use of continuing an agitation which could not possibly be fruitful of good, and might possibly be pregnant with serious harm; for it could not fail to cause irritation and annoyance in our great dependency—a dependency to which Lancashire owed so much of her prosperity of past years, to which she owed so much now, and to which he hoped she would owe so much for centuries to come. I venture to say that language like this coming from a leading representative of Lancashire, is worthy of that great county and the great industries in it. I hope we shall have no more of these irritating statements. It is of the first importance that every man, whatever position of responsibility he holds, to maintain the feelings of confidence and goodwill between every part of this Empire. I deeply regret that it should have been thought necessary to have what must assume more or less of the character of a party and political division upon such a question as this. But, Sir, if the Government are called upon to meet that issue, they are ready to meet it. If it should be their fate to fall in such a cause, there is no cause, I think, in which a Government could more worthily fall. (Ministerial cheers.) But I should most deeply regret if the result of a vote of the House of Commons to-night be to establish a feeling of irritation between Lancashire and India, and leave upon the mind of the great population for whose welfare we are responsible the lasting sense that they had not justice to expect from the British House of Commons. (Cheers and counter cheers.)

Lord **George Hamilton**: I need not apologise for taking part in this discussion at this hour. About twenty years ago, when the agitation commenced for the repeal of the cotton duties, I was the representative of the Indian Department, and the exponent of the policy of the Government of that day in this House. And therefore I hope the House will excuse me if I occupy its attention for a few minutes. I wish to say that the right hon. gentleman has reversed the policy which the House of Commons twenty years ago deliberately adopted, and he will find that in doing so he has embarked in troubles and disturbances of which he has little conception. The views which I myself held twenty years ago as to the impolicy of imposing cotton duties upon English goods, I hold still, and the distinguished chief under whom I then had the honour of serving, Lord Salisbury, held those views, and also holds them still.

(Cheers.) At the time I speak of, twenty years ago, an agitation went on against these duties, deputation after deputation of members of Parliament came to the Indian Office to urge the injustice of the taxation to which they and their constituents were subject. We looked most carefully into the situation and found that we could not meet the objectors in argument. The present Secretary of State for India is an able and distinguished man, but he must recollect that the two men who determined upon the abolition of the Indian cotton duties were men of the very highest distinction and authority in their respective spheres both of thought and action, namely, Sir Louis Malet and Lord Salisbury. The Secretary of State has quoted the name of Mr. Cobden, but the name of Sir Louis Malet in this matter stands higher in my opinion than that of Mr. Cobden. (Hear, hear.) Sir Louis Malet, who, during the earlier part of his life successfully devoted himself to breaking down the hostile tariffs of foreign countries, during the latter part of his life no less successfully devoted himself to establishing an unity of interest in this question between England and her great dependency. Now the grounds upon which at that time we arrived at the conclusion that it was absolutely necessary to abolish these duties were two-fold: First, the tax was an unfair tax as far as Lancashire was concerned, and that was part of the question to which Sir Louis Malet specially devoted his attention. Lord Salisbury looked at the question from another aspect altogether. He arrived at the conclusion that these duties ought to be abolished on the ground that their imposition was a subject of dangerous contention—dangerous to the stability of our Government in India. It was in that view that he induced the House of Commons to assent to our policy. The agitation was bitterly fought. The Duke of Argyll, then one of the leaders of the Liberal party, and the late Mr. Fawcett fought stubbornly against our policy, but, so conclusive was the argument, that we were able to pass a resolution with the unanimous assent of this House for the abolition of the cotton duties. In that resolution there was no mention of protection, but two years afterwards another resolution was assented to by the House of Commons on the same subject, and from that resolution all mention of protection was omitted, thus showing that it was the intention that these import duties should be abolished. A change of Government took place. The member for Midlothian came into office. In the meantime all duties which were in any sense protected had been removed. But they had arrived at a higher quality of cotton goods, and, owing to the way in which the tariff was adjusted, further action was necessary. The last relic of these import duties was then abolished. That was the policy deliberately arrived at after long consideration, and now, in the middle of a dull recess, without giving the House an opportunity for discussion, without consulting any representatives from Lancashire, and contrary to what we believed was the understanding, these duties were suddenly imposed. What is the plea? They say there was danger. Well, the House will recollect that a year ago, when there was an Indian Loan Bill before the House, the Chancellor of the Exchequer informed us that if the Bill did not pass India would be bankrupt. We are used to these statements. (Laughter.) I have been long connected with the administration of India, and I know something about India. I agree that we should listen to the voice of India, but if we want to hear the real voice of India, we must not go to Bombay and Calcutta for that purpose. Those semi-Europeanised cities do not represent India. (Hear, hear.) It is a peculiarity that certain sections of those two capitals, having adopted Western ideas, have adopted with singular skill the Western methods of agitation. They have their press and their political organisations. The result is that there is no country on the face of the world where the shrieking units of society can make themselves so well heard, and where the dumb millions are so quiescent, as in India. (Laughter and cheers.) I know the gentlemen who get up these agitations. Let the right hon. gentleman propose an income-tax or death duties, and he will very soon find out that there is much more danger in proposing taxation than in dealing with cotton. (Laughter.) These people are always opposed to any taxation of any sort that touches themselves, and when there is any difficulty to be met they always say, "Oh! tax cotton or raise the salt duty." (Laughter.) The most important part of the speech of the right hon. gentleman was that in which he gave his reasons for the necessity of these duties. He said that the deficiency which existed last year had been increased by the fall in exchange from 1s. 2d. to 1s. 1d. This shows how largely this is a currency question, but the Government have resolutely refused to listen to any proposal made from any quarter for the reform of the currency. The Government having refused the proposals of the Indian Government for a conference, resorted to the remedy of closing the mints for the manufacture of silver, by which they attempted to give an artificial value to the rupee. That was a quack remedy which reduced the price of silver all over the world. The merit claimed for it was that it would ensure the rupee's remaining at 1s. 3d. for purposes of exchange, but the rupee has fallen to 1s. 1d., and in consequence of that fall the Government are now imposing cotton duties on goods imported into India. Is this the only remedy open to the Government? If it is, and if silver should continue to fall, even this 5 per cent. duty will not be sufficient to meet the deficiency, and the Government will have to keep on increasing the duty. It is, therefore, necessary at the outset of this policy to protest strongly against a measure which must result in the erection of so hostile barrier against the importation of cotton goods into India. The Secretary of State for India has made a very candid and conciliatory speech, and I understood the right hon. gentleman to undertake to eliminate from his plan anything approaching or resembling Protection. The right hon gentleman has also said that he has safeguarded the interests of Lancashire by the imposition of an Excise duty. But has he really done what he thought? For my part I disbelieve altogether in the efficiency of an Excise duty for that purpose. (Hear, hear.) The opinion of those who considered this question twenty years ago was that the imposition of Excise duties in India could not be viewed as a satisfactory method of taxation, and the reason was that in India there was not a reliable official machinery for the purposes of investigation and taxation. Judging from the experience supplied by the past, I hold that there is very little likelihood of this proposed Excise duty being enforced and fulfilling the purpose for which it is intended. I will test the right hon. gentleman's undertaking to reconsider any part of his scheme which can be shown to savour of Protection. The foundation of the legislation of the right hon. gentleman was that the price of American cotton was 4d. a pound. (Hear, hear, and cries of "No.") But supposing that it can be purchased under 4d. and at 3d., the coarser goods manufactured out of it could compete with the coarser goods made in India. If this should prove to be the case, would the right hon. gentleman put an excise duty on the coarse goods in India, so that the Lancashire goods might not be handicapped, by the import duty? Then, why is the excise duty to be levied upon yarn and the customs duty upon cloth? Surely, considering the difference in value between yarn and cloth, that amounts to Protection. The right hon. gentleman the Secretary of State for India adopted a very high doctrine when he said he had to pay very special attention to the wishes of India. I agree, but if we are always to pay attention to the wants of India, are the positions to be reciprocal? (Hear, hear.) The Indian Government must pay some attention to the wishes and wants of the English electors. (Hear, hear.) The right hon. gentleman asked if they would attempt to deal with any self-governing colony on the same principle as it was proposed to apply to India. There is no point of resemblance between India and a self-governing colony. Self-governing colonies are self-supporting and self-maintaining. The Government of India is neither the one nor the other—(hear, hear)—and only lives on the moral and material support which it derives from England. If we deprive the Indian Government of the financial and military assistance it derives from England it will fall into a state of inanition and collapse. (Hear, hear.) England has paid a heavy tax, both in blood and money, for having set up a Government in India, and nobody—it may surprise some hon. members to hear it—who has ever looked into it would arrive at any other conclusion than that it is in no sense a good financial bargain. We have to maintain a large military force, some 60,000 young soldiers, and the death rate amongst these in India is some indication of the price we pay for the maintenance of our Government. It is not an empire artificially created and artificially maintained, and we should not make a selfish use of our power to exclude Indian ideas or wishes from influencing the Government of the country. (Hear, hear.) But at the same time we have a right to say that such a system as this should not be tolerated. We ought to express an opinion on the mis-policy of the Government in imposing these duties. In Lancashire there are great political interests and industrial wealth and of course she is feeling irritation and I hope that by means other than political agitation these duties may either be weakened or repealed for I should much regret if they were carried by means of political agitation outside and inside this House. (Cheers.) I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman who moved this motion is going to divide or whether he will be satisfied by the statement made by the Secretary of State for India. If he does divide I shall be happy to vote with him. (Hear, hear.) The Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for India seem to believe that a general party vote must be taken to-night upon the question of these cotton duties which almost is to be made to turn out the Government. The speeches on this side of the House I think must have disposed of any such rumour. (Hear, hear.) Differences of opinion there were when these cotton duties were abolished and when they were imposed, and I am sure the Secretary of State for India, short time as he has been in office, has found that he has put his heel into a nest of hornets by assenting to this unwise proposition. (Laughter.) What we wish to do in India is to impose all that is stable and permanent into the Government but we are forced to submit its policy, its arrangements, its duties, and all its wishes to a popular assembly. Twelve years ago we unanimously abolished these duties and I regret that they have been re-imposed, and if a division takes place I will vote with those who moved the adjournment of the House. I shall do so as a protest against the Government for their inaction on the currency question and against the imposition of the cotton duties. I shall also vote in favour of the motion as a protest against the unwisdom and unfairness of putting the whole burden of saving the solvency of the Indian Government on the shoulders of one already very distressed industry. (Cheers.)

Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji: At this late hour I shall not occupy the House very long, but I will ask hon. gentlemen opposite: Does England spend a single farthing in connection with India? Hon. gentlemen say they are maintaining the Empire. It is something extraordinary! For the two hundred years they have been connected with India they have not spent a single farthing either on the acquisition or the maintenance of the Empire. However, I will not go into that large question. (Hear, hear.) Did I wish to see the Empire in India endangered, were I a rebel at heart, I should welcome this motion with the greatest delight. The great danger to the Empire is to adopt methods of irritation, which if continued will assuredly bring about disintegration. (Hear, hear.) I appeal to the Unionists to vote against this motion or they will drive the first nail in the coffin of British rule in India. You may, as Lord Roberts has told you, have a stronger and larger army in India than you have at present; you may have that army perfection itself; but your stability rests entirely upon the satisfaction of the people. (Hear, hear.) I heard with great satisfaction hon. members on both sides of the House recognise this important fact, that after all, the whole safety of the British rule depends upon the satisfaction of the people, and the justice that may be done towards them. Remember whatever you are, you are still like a stepmother—children may submit to any amount of oppression from their own mother, and will be affectionate towards her, but from their stepmother they will always demand the strictest justice. (Hear, hear.) You must remember that you as an alien people have to rule over a large number of people in the Indian Empire, and if you do not consult their feelings, you will make a very great mistake. I am quite sure that I appeal not in vain to the Unionists, and can I appeal to the Home Rulers. (Hear, hear.) If they mean Home Rule, they mean that it must be entirely on the integrity of the Empire. (Hear, hear.) I have never known a motion brought before this House which was more separatist than the one before it now. (Hear, hear.) I can count upon the votes of Home Rulers. The passing of this motion would be the passing of a motion of disunion. Perhaps you may not feel the effect for some time, but I impress upon this great assembly—that though a revolution may not take place to-morrow, it is the accumulation of many years, of many disappointments, many inattentions, that at last produces a revolution. Do not forget 1857. I, for one, desire from the bottom of my heart that the British rule and connection with India may last for a very long time. (Hear, hear.) They are dealing with many millions of people, and I desire and hope that India to-morrow will not receive a telegram saying that this motion has been passed. The feeling of injustice is very strong there. India has its agitators. What were the occupiers of the Treasuny Bench? Did they not go up and down the country endeavouring to educate the people and to disseminate their own opinions? And so does the Opposition and every member. It is by peaceful agitation alone that British India is to be preserved. This is not the first occasion that our Lancashire friends have tried to force the hands of the Government to do certain things adverse to India. They began in 1700. But I am not going on this grave occasion to enter into any petty quarrel with them. (Hear, hear.) This I will say, British India is too poor to buy Manchester goods. People talked of the enormous Manchester trade. There was no such enormous trade, unless 15s. 6d. per head per annum was an enormous trade. I appeal to all parties not to let this motion pass. (Hear, hear.) I appeal to you not to let a telegram go forth to India, saying that it has been passed. It will have a very bad effect there. You have your remedy in the assurance of the Secretary for India, that if you can point out how to remove the alleged protective character of these duties, he will do it. You are bound to be satisfied with that assurance. I again earnestly hope that the motion will not be allowed to pass. (Hear, hear.)

Sir Frederick Milner: I have given very careful consideration to this question and endeavoured to read both sides. I look upon this as an Imperial question, and I feel that if this motion were carried it would have a very serious effect on the country; therefore, as I have never given a dishonest vote in this House, I feel constrained to vote with the Government in this case. But I am in this difficulty—it has been laid down during the debate on the Address on behalf of the Government that if you gave your vote with a different party to which you belong, and if you go into the same lobby with them that therefore you must be considered to be an associate which I should very much dislike to be supposed. (Cheers.) If I go into the lobby with the Government to-night I may say that I do not in any way associate myself with them, because I look upon the Government as a most mischievous Government. (Much laughter.)

The House divided just before midnight. The figures were:

For Sir Henry James's Motion	109
Against	304
Government majority ..	195

The announcement of the figures was received with general cheering.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI. Supplement No. 2. APRIL, 1895.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from February 26th to March 21st.

Imperial Parliament.

February 26th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIA AND BIMETALLISM.

Mr. EVERETT moved a resolution declaring that the House regarded with increasing apprehension the growing divergence in the relative value of gold and silver, and urging upon the Government the desirability of an international Conference on the subject.

In moving his resolution on the subject, Mr. EVERETT said: I respectfully submit to this House that the world has never had so great an economical question before it as that which confronts it to-day in the shape of the silver question. That question in the belief of many is at the root of the great financial troubles in India—troubles so great that they have compelled a Free Trade Government sorely against its will to interfere with the external free trade of India by imposing import duties at the ports, and with its internal free trade by putting excise duties on the products of the mills. Later on the hon. member said that it was one of the results of the demonetisation of silver in England and in other European countries that debts had to be paid in appreciated gold, so being practically doubled. He went on: The Chancellor of the Exchequer cannot leave out of account the greatly added-to weight of the debt of India—the steadily growing weight of debt which oppresses the Government of India and compels a Free Trade Government to throw away all its principles and to go in for a kind of Protection.

Mr. HENRY CHAPLIN, seconding Mr. Everett's motion, said: I propose to draw attention to some other evils. The facts already stated are notorious, and cannot be denied. Let us not forget that although it is quite true that one-third of the people of the world at the present time use gold as their standard, yet there are two-thirds who still use silver in spite of all that has been done against them, and yet it is a fact that we have had some of the strongest monometallists in this country declaring within the last year or two that they would see no evils impending in the world if silver was disused as a standard altogether. I won't characterise these utterances as they might be characterised, but will turn to the condition of our great dependency in India and to her financial situation at the present time. What is the real cause of the financial difficulty in India? Why the Secretary of State for India told us in this House a few nights ago that the real cause of her difficulty was the fall in exchange. What is the fall in the exchange due to? Why to nothing else but the divergence between gold and silver, which is one of the objects pointed out in the motion of my hon. friend. For years the Indian Government has been approaching this, and has been imploring the Government of England to do something to re-establish silver. What have you done? You have adopted an exactly opposite policy. Blow after blow has been made at silver, and most of all by this Government. You closed the mints in India, depriving her of the last great market that was open to her; and not satisfied with that you imposed a duty on the silver imports into India, whilst leaving gold to go in perfectly free. By your own deliberate action you have increased the fall in the exchange, though you, in order to get out of your difficulties, only a short time ago, as a last resource, fell back upon that unfortunate textile industry in Lancashire, and by imposing a tax upon it tried to help yourselves out of a difficulty which you had been so singularly instrumental in creating. (Hear, hear.) That was why I gave my vote the other night, more than for the reasons advanced, for the hon. member for Bury's motion. (A laugh.) But I protest against the whole financial policy of Her Majesty's Government in India which has rendered it absolutely necessary for them to impose that cruel tax upon that great industry of Lancashire at a time when she was never less able to bear it. The Secretary for India the other night gave us some startling figures with regard to the loss which had been incurred by the exchange in the year 1894-1895; but I am going to give you some information of a more startling character still. I asked a question as to what was the total loss by exchange during the last twenty years in India, and what it comes to, so far as I can work it out, is this: five millions of pounds per year, and that multiplied by twenty gives one hundred millions sterling, which now has to be recouped by the extra taxation of the natives of India, for whom you are expressing so much solicitude.

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: You must, on the other side, look at the value of the rupee.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That I must leave to the hon. gentleman, whether it be 100 millions, or 50 millions, or 70 millions, there is no doubt there has been during the last twenty years an enormous loss which has fallen on the exchange by the difference between gold and silver, which now has to be recouped by an extra taxation imposed upon the natives of India, another of the serious evils pointed out in the motion of my hon. friend. (Hear, hear.) I now go to another question, that of the textile industries of the North of England. It is not only to the cotton industry, however, that there has been an injury. The cotton industry, as you all know, has been greatly hampered and embarrassed by the fall in the exchange. There are plenty of gentlemen who are able to speak more on that subject than I can. There can be no doubt while it acts as a protective duty on goods sent from this country to the East, it gives to the manufacturers in the East an immense advantage over their competitors in the West, and it is inflicting, and has been inflicting for years, most serious loss on that industry in Lancashire. (Hear, hear.) Then, again, I turn to the wheat industry. No one has attempted to meet or explain some figures which I quoted the other night which seem to apply in this case. They show unfortunately a diminution in the wheat crop of the whole world. There has been a heavy fall in the production of wheat, and I can show in a few words that that is largely due to the fall in exchange created by the divergence of the metals. India is one of our competitors in the wheat trade, and she competes under this great advantage. The English sovereign to-day will exchange for 20 rupees where formerly it exchanged for ten, for it has fallen in recent years in gold value from 2s. to 1s. Although wheat has fallen in this country from 40s. to 20s. a quarter, the Indian grower is still getting 20 rupees a quarter for his wheat. We know as a matter of fact that the silver price in India has hardly changed at all. As a matter of fact up to the time when you insisted on closing the mints there had been little or no change in the prices in India. Well, the 20 rupees which are obtained by the Indian grower are in consequence as valuable to him, and will bring as much for him in India as they ever brought before, and he is enabled to take a good price for his wheat, which spells positive ruin to the grower in this country, but makes no change in his position. Those gentlemen who listened as I did the other night to the impressive words of my right hon. friend the member for St. George's, when he pointed out to the House the enormous danger of a great country like this becoming dependent for the great staple of its food supply on foreign countries, must agree this is a matter which, unless my theories can be contradicted and disproved, does deserve the consideration of this House. (Hear, hear.) The Chancellor of the Exchequer taunted my right hon. friend with retreating from the Protectionist doctrines of forty years ago. I don't know what the House thinks, but I think that the Protectionist prophecies of forty years ago are all of them becoming fulfilled, and very rapidly too. (Hear, hear.) What we desire is to do our best to remedy the evils arising from the causes mentioned in the motion of my hon. friend and to find for them a remedy. I want to say a word in answer to a question which is being continually put, namely, why do these fluctuations occur—what is the cause of this divergence? It never used to be the case before. Your trade with the East in former days was conducted without these difficulties. You had no trouble formerly with your rupee; it never altered in its value. No complaints came from Lancashire about the fall in exchange, and no complaints from the wheat grower in this country, neither had there been a great and general fall in prices. You accepted Free Trade, and foreign competition came closer to your doors year by year and day by day. What is the cause of it all? Why are there to-day these extraordinary changes in the relative value of metals which were never heard of or known before? And on this point I desire to impress upon the House what has been said by the proposer of this motion. Is it the immensely increased supplies of silver which are now produced? Is it the greater variation in the relative amounts of metals now produced compared with what it used to be in former days? That is a reason very commonly ascribed for it, but I believe there is no greater delusion in the world, and that if anybody would take the trouble to patiently study the statistics on this point, he would find that the variations in the production of metals were infinitely greater during all these years in which the relative value remained perfectly steady prior to 1873 than they have ever been since that time. No, Sir, these things cannot be ascribed to that, but to the great change which took place in the monetary laws of America and in half-a-dozen other countries on the continent, which occurred some twenty years ago. All the gold and all the silver that was to be found in the world were, so to speak, potential money. The law created an universal and unlimited demand for both silver and gold. All that was found could be taken to the mints in any quantity they pleased, and the mints were bound to take it and turn it into legal tender at a given rate, and in that way it went into circulation, and *pro tanto* increased the volume of money all over the world. You must remember that during all this time population, trade, commodities, and the demand for money in the world were steadily increasing, but the additions to the volume of money readily made by the constant supply of these metals was just sufficient to meet the increased demand and to keep the general level of prices practically steady for a great number of years without any very great change. That was one effect; another was that, as has already been pointed out, it kept the two metals practically steady, because nobody would ever dream of taking less for any one of them than at any moment he could command, and at which any one of these mints was bound by law to take it. All that is unfortunately now changed. The law was altered some twenty years ago. All these mints were closed to the coinage of silver whilst they were still left open to gold, and silver being deprived of these great markets immediately began to fall, and it fell steadily, though not always rapidly, from that time down to 1893. What happened in 1893? Another mortal blow was aimed at silver, this time by the action of the English Government. They closed the Indian mint, which was the chief market left, and the effect of that operation was instantaneous on silver. It fell 8d. an ounce in a single week, a thing absolutely unknown in the history of that metal during the existence of the world; and there is no reason why, if silver is to continue to be treated in this way (the metal which forms the standard of value for two-thirds of the population of the world) it should not become absolutely worthless except as a metal for ordinary merchandise. (Hear. hear.) It is impossible to discuss all the different schemes upon an occasion like the present, but surely they are very good subjects for consideration. I would mention only one as an instance. I would ask the House to remember that we are the great Eastern as well as the great Western empire in the world. I cannot see why as regards the Eastern portion of our empire we should not join in an arrangement with other Powers to re-open our mints in India to silver, providing they are willing to re-open theirs, and give an undertaking at the same time to give every facility to promote the use of silver in England short of actually changing our standard. There are many representations on these points well deserving the attention of the House contained in the report of the Gold and Silver Commission, and if I remember rightly it was the right hon. gentleman the member for the University of London (Sir J. Lubbock) who was responsible for making many of these recommendations. I have of course no means of knowing whether or how far any proposal of a kind such as I have indicated will be acceptable to foreign countries, but it seems to me to be worthy of careful consideration. With regard to the Indian Government, I cannot doubt that the Secretary of State for India would adopt such a proposal as this in rapture. To the bimetallists in the House, I believe the proposal would be acceptable, and I really see no reason in the world why it should offend the susceptibilities of the most convinced monometallist present. Nobody who has carefully studied the question can doubt, I think, for a moment that it would have the effect of immensely lessening the evils of monometallism, and if that were so I cannot conceive why any gentleman in the House should think it necessary to object to the proposal that a conference should meet and that England should join in that conference for the purpose of considering this among other suggestions that might be made for the purpose of mitigating the evils of which my right hon. friend complained. I hope we shall not be taunted with a desire to tamper with the currency. That is a very old phrase, but it is very warmly adopted by the right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Assuredly no minister ever tampered with the currency more effectually than the right hon. gentleman did when he closed the mints in India—(hear, hear)—with the avowed object of giving a scarcity value to the rupee. But increasing the value of the rupee means, *pro tanto*, artificially decreasing the price of everything else which is measured by the rupee. I always notice this pecularity on the part of gentlemen who hold these particular views. If the currency laws are altered so as artificially to depress prices, then it is always the most wise and beneficent legislation; but if by any possibility the alteration of the laws has the effect of raising prices, then the offence of tampering with the currency has been committed. If it is right to alter the currency for one effect it is right to alter it for the other. I have the authority of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Balfour) for saying that if he had been able to be present, he would have given his cordial support to the motion. (Hear, hear.) We who have been the supporters and advocates of these views for many years have had very unusual difficulties to contend with, and have been met with opposition unscrupulous in the extreme. But it cannot be denied that we have recently been steadily making way. Whatever be the issue of this debate, I am absolutely assured that at no distant date victory on this question will be ours, because we have on our side experience, justice, argument, reason and scientific truth, and in the long run these are absolutely certain to prevail. (Hear, hear.)

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, towards the end of a long speech dealing with the general question, said: The right hon. gentleman (Mr. Chaplin) has referred to the case of India, and it is the case of India which makes me ready to admit that the difficulty of the depreciation of silver is a very serious matter. That I acknowledge in full. That difficulty was carefully considered by the Royal Commission on the subject, and there are some words in the report of the Commission which embody a very serious warning and which the House will do well to take into account. And this is not a question simply of exchange, it is a question of the interests of the people of India. Allow me to read the words of the report; they are most important:—"Turning next for a moment to the special dangers to India which might result from adopting this ratio, we would remark that although the Government of India would undoubtedly be a gainer in so far as the burden of its gold debt would be diminished yet there would be at least a serious risk of substantial mischief to the people of India. Any change having the effect of lowering silver prices, while taxes and charges remained unaltered, might occasion serious discontent, and if it were seen to be a consequence of political action it might create political dangers as grave as any that are likely to result from a continuance of the present conditions. Further, if it be true that cotton manufactures in India have been fostered and stimulated by the fall in silver it would be a serious matter, and certainly likely to engender great discontent, if by an act of the State the manufacturing industry thus created were seriously hampered if not destroyed." The members for Lancashire can sympathise with that. The report proceeds: "Although we have not felt ourselves able to recommend that this country should enter into negotiations with the view of establishing a bimetallic system of currency, we have indicated that we are fully sensible of the considerations which have been urged by the Government of India; and we think that every proposal which seems calculated to diminish these difficulties and to ease the existing situation is deserving of very careful consideration, and that an earnest endeavour should be made to adopt any plan which should appear to promise substantial advantage without the risk of greater evils. We think however that the consideration of this or any other proposal of Indian legislation for removing the difficulties of the Government the interests of India should alone be considered. While we cannot recommend that the mother country should run any serious risk in altering its system of currency in order to assist the dependency, we think that the Government of the latter should be allowed a free hand to deal with the problem as it considers best to its own interests." It was upon that recommendation that we concurred with the Government of India in closing the mints. The recommendation was that the mother country should not run any serious risk by altering its currency—that is, by the adoption of bimetallism—but that the Indian Government should be allowed a free hand. That is the course we adopted in regard to the closing of the mints.

Mr. WILSON LLOYD, following the Chancellor of the Exchequer, said: The Secretary for India observed the other night that every member of this House was indeed a member for India. (Hear, hear.) If so, let us consider whether we are doing justly to India and to the natives of India in neglecting their interests, when we are not able to relieve that immense pressure which exists between that country and her financial relations with this country. Assuming a stable ratio to be secured, what effect would it have upon the evils with which we have to deal? We have the Gold and Silver Commission with us: they have realised the condition of matters. They took evidence and made a report, and they say it would be an advantage to this country to have certain relations to India based upon a better system of currency. Would it not be justice to India to try to see if we cannot bring our currency into a more convenient form, commercially, for both countries than now exists? What did the Secretary of State for India tell us? He said it was the fall in the price of the rupee that was at the bottom of the difficulty. He has considered the question as far as he could, but he was forced, under pressure, to put them off. It seems to me that the Government should not do such an extreme thing as put duties on cotton goods. That should be only done in an extreme case. If they were in such a difficulty that they were obliged to close the mints in India, surely that is a reason for their doing something in the direction mentioned by this Conference. I think we have a very strong claim upon the Government to ask them to do something to relieve the immense pressure, a pressure intense on our industrial centres from Belfast to Lancashire, and from Staffordshire to South Wales. The pressure in India is also great, and it has forced them to adopt the import duties against their free trade principles. If the conditions are so pressing what these facts show, both as regards our own commercial and industrial centres and our great dependency India, is that there is a great crisis existing in this country and between us and onr great dependency, and between us and other great countries, and I think we can ask the Government really to look into this question. We have not got the solution; let them give it to us. Do not let them go on with their disestablishment and enfranchisment Bills till they have given us some solution of this question which is agitating and distressing the commercial world—till they have given us some way of removing the cause which is producing such dreadful effects between ourselves and India. If there is a motion that the House could properly take up it is this. Let it do so and endeavour to heal those wounds which now exist in the industrial world in this Empire and in our great dependency in India. (Cheers.)

Sir JOHN LENG: I have not taken part in any previons discussion on this subject becanse I felt the great difficulty surrounding any proposal to establish a fixed relation between two metals of which the production of one is much larger than that of the other. But the difficulty in my mind is as nothing compared with the great difficulties which beset an important branch of industry with which my constituents are connected, namely, the jute industry. I hold in my hand a letter from a gentleman who has been for many years the head of a large firm in that industry, who says that there is no doubt that the condition of all trades in silver-using countries grows worse and worse; he considers that the very existence of Dundee is threatened, and he feels that the currency question is at the root of the evil. I have also had placed in my hands a letter from a member of the largest firm in the jute trade in this kingdom, if not the largest in the world, who says, "Our local trade (jute) is being gradually swamped through the advantage accruing to our Eastern competitors by the divergence in the value of gold and silver in which wages are paid here and there respectively." The jute industry is a great and rapidly growing industry in Dundee, but its growth has been checked, and it is now in a very unprofitable condition. Large limited companies are paying no dividends, and their balance-sheets have shown recently very serious losses. Why is this? It is owing to the competition of mills in Calcutta, which are being established there by British capital and which are under British management, under the control and having the support of this country. No doubt there are natural difficulties in connection with the jute industry in Scotland. The mills in India have the first choice of material, they are approximate to our Eastern markets, and more particularly they have cheap labour. But Dundee would be able to compete with India but for the fact that the industry in this country is very heavily handicapped by the fact of the fall of the rupee. India is practically only paying half wages as contrasted with what it formally paid, the rupee being now worth, speaking roundly, only 1s. as against 2s. The remarkable thing is that the wages in India have not been rising at all in proportion to the depreciation in the rupee. This depreciation acts as a bounty on the manufacture of Indian mills. The result has been an extraordinary development in the jute industry in Calentta and in that region. Since 1882 many new and large mills have been built, and great extensions have been made to the old ones. One mill is now running twenty-two hours out of the twenty-four with the electric light, and the electric light is being introduced into other mills, and there is little doubt that were a spurt to take place in the trade, most of the Indian mills would run night and day, twenty-two hours out of the twenty-four, they having the advantage of working under a system which is not permitted in this country. The number of looms in India has increased from 3,400 to 10,000, and the export of jute goods from India which in 1873-74 amounted in value to only 204,000 tens of rupees, in the last year (according to the Statistical Abstract for 1892-93) has increased from 200,000 tens of rupees to 3,200,000 tens of rupees. The Indian merchants and manufacturers are now attracting from this country the whole of the Eastern market, the Australian market, and the Californian markets, and they are sending very large quantities of goods to New York and Philadelphia, and, not only so, but their goods are being planted in London and even sent to Dundee itself. This state of affairs is exceedingly serious. A correspondent who is intimately connected with the trade writes: "The stimulus to the growth of the jute manufacturing industry by the depreciation of the rupee did not operate strongly in the beginning of the fall, but when instead of 2d. it came to 4d., then to 6d. and 8d. and 10d., on 2s., it told with increasing force. The position as between Calcutta and Dundee is that wages are little if any higher in Calcutta now than they were twenty years ago, and that goods exported to a gold producing country produce nearly double the amount of rupees they did then. Dundee gets no benefit except in the sterling price of jute, but that adjusts itself in the exchange." My correspondent lays it down as a settled proposition that "a fall in the gold value of the rupee gives an advantage to the Indian manufacturer to the extent of the fall on the number of rupees paid in wages." Sir, I have thought it well to bring these facts, illustrating the position of a special industry, before the House in connection with this subject, because, as the hon. gentleman who spoke before me showed, a large number of trades are affected by it. Now, Sir, I think that those who are interested in this subject must hail with satisfaction the intimation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he is not opposed to the holding of another Conference on this subject. It may possibly be some time before that Conference is summoned, and I should be very glad indeed if it were preceded by an inquiry in our own country, by which such facts as I have mentioned can be approached and sifted. Allusion has been made to what occurred in 1892. But a very rapid development has occurred on this question during the intervening years. (Hear, hear.) New facts have come to our knowledge, new opinions are being formed, and ideas are becoming matured. There was one statement made by the right hon. gentleman (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) that I, for one, regret. He seemed to indicate that if another Conference were summoned those who attended it on behalf of Her Majesty's Government would do so simply as delegates with very distinct instructions from this country and bound to vote according to those instructions. I fear that would very greatly diminish the value of such a Conference. Such a Conference to be held, to meet at all the wishes and desires of the people of this country who are so seriously affected by this question, should be a deliberative Conference. (Cheers.) The gentlemen who attend it, as members of this House or of other assemblies, should be at liberty to form their own opinions on the statements they hear and on the arguments put before them. Little can be expected from a Conference if all its members are to go to it under cast iron instructions, and are not to be allowed to exercise their own judgment. Therefore, as I have said, seeing the great advancement in views upon this question in recent years, which I hope will continue, I trust that before another Conference is held such representations will be made to Her Majesty's Government as will induce them to modify their views in this respect.

Mr. **Forwood**, after regretting that the Government had run the risk of raising false hopes by the acceptance of Mr. Everett's motion, said: This agitation for bimetallism largely comes from Lancashire, the great staple of which county is cotton. The manufacturer of cotton in Lancashire finds that the workman in India continues to manufacture at the same rate of wages—payable in silver at its present depreciated value—as that which he received when silver was double the price. I gather that the desire of the hon. member for Dundee is to influence and raise the value of silver in India so that it shall not be of so large a purchasing power as it is to-day to the native who receives his wages in silver. I think it would be exceedingly selfish of us in this country to legislate on this question simply from an English manufacturer's point of view —(hear, hear)—for we should be, under such circumstances, placing the Indian manufacturer and the Indian workman at a disadvantage in order to bring more trade to our towns. (Cheers.)

Sir J. **Leng**: The right hon. gentleman misapprehends the effect of my statement, which was this: that there is and would be no change in the conditions in India, but the change which has occurred has been very adverse to our manufacturers in this country. It would have no effect whatever on the purchasing power of the wage earner in India.

Mr. **Forwood**: I must say that I cannot follow that proposition. The point made is that to-day the Indian workman is able to work at a certain price in India for silver, having regard to its purchasing power, and the proposal of the bimetallist is to raise the price of silver by adjusting its relations with gold. To do that would be to reduce the purchasing price in India of the wages paid to the natives. It has been stated that the depreciation in the value of silver has been caused by artificial means. But, Sir, in my judgment that depreciation has been caused by the artificial legislation of the United States; and if we were to give silver a certain relation to gold in this country and make it a legal tender irrespective of amount we should already be, what I may term, watering down our own currency and increasing its volume, and reducing the value of that currency in the wages paid to the workmen. I feel satisfied from my own experience in silver countries where silver is paid that the last to receive any benefit would be the wages of the workmen. If you watered down our own currency by introducing the payment in silver of workmen's wages, which there has been such an immense difficulty in raising to their present standard, you would have to begin again to raise those wages in order to replace yourselves in the position you have now attained having regard to our present currency, and in the end the result might be the same. After all, each commodity may be taken to represent only so many tokens; money is only a token. You may increase the number of tokens each commodity represents, but the cost of living to the workman will remain practically the same. The depreciation of commodities does not in my opinion arise in any way from the silver question, but from the extraordinary over-production in recent years.

Colonel **Bridgeman** said: The fact that the rupee has depreciated so much in value is, we believe, one of the great causes of the present depreciation. I hold in my hand two coins, very similar in appearance and size—a florin and a rupee. The former contains 161½ grains of silver, the latter 165 grains, and therefore the latter ought, according to weight, to be the more valuable. The florin can be exchanged as the tenth of a sovereign, but if you take ten rupees you cannot get a sovereign for them—you have to give eighteen and a-half or nineteen rupees to get your sovereign. The effect of that is that the labourer of India, who is paid in what we call a debased currency, practically gets a bounty at the expense of our agricultural labourer and cotton operative. I did not note that the Chancellor of the Exchequer made any effort to grapple with that part of the question, but I assure him that agriculturists and cotton spinners will never be content until this question has been more thoroughly threshed out.

Sir G. **Chesney** congratulated the House on the advance of sound economic opinion in regard to bimetallism, and continued: It is sometimes said that if bimetallism were adopted in England it would also have to be extended to India. Undoubtedly the country which suffers most from the present state of things is England. The people of this country have to bear the greater part of the existing distress, but certainly what England has lost India has in one way gained. If India stood alone, if she were self-contained, and as independent of other circumstances as, say, China and Japan, she might be left to go her own way and enjoy the advantage of a silver standard. But that is not the case. India is hampered and her Government is bound down by her enormous gold debt. The one want of India is English capital, and in the present depressed state of silver English capital is very shy indeed. If there is one thing India requires at the present time it is a further extension of her railways, but so long as this question of currency remains unsettled, it is almost hopeless to expect that English capital will be sent in any quantity. The worst of the depression of her currency is the uncertainty of her ratio from day to day. That at the present moment is completely paralysing her trade. What ought to constitute legitimate business transactions between the two countries it is no exaggeration to say now almost amounts to pure gambling, and we cannot be surprised therefore if the financial position of India is practically paralysed. I think we may look on the resolution which has been accepted by the Government, imperfect though it may be, as the first step towards the solution of a great problem.

Sir S. **Montague**: Is not the suspension of bimetallism an unmitigated evil? and is not every country in the world the worse for the depreciation of silver? The financial action which was taken by the Government in India was a wise precaution, but I wish that the Government would display a little more real appreciation of the currency troubles. (Hear, hear.) The supporters of bimetallism would be disappointed if they thought it would act as a panacea for all the evils of commerce. For example, suppose the value of the rupee were raised from 13d. to 16d. the price of wheat would not be materially changed, because against that possible advance you would have to put over-production, increased transport facilities by land and sea, and other conditions, besides the depreciation of silver. Inconvertible paper in Argentina had the same effect in diminishing the gold value of labour.

Mr. Montagu: I am of opinion that we ought to look at this question not only from the point of view of England itself, but from our position as a great Eastern empire which is far the largest in Asia in importance. We have a trade with India alone that amounts to over 110 millions a year.

Mr. Lough: I deny emphatically that the depreciation in the value of silver has caused low prices. The value of the Indian rupee was never so low as it is at the present time, and yet some Indian commodities are forty per cent. dearer than they used to be. I say it is a proof that the price of the commodity does not depend on the value of the rupee, but that it depends on the demand for that commodity. (Hear, hear.) I think the cause for the present condition of things in India must be looked for in other quarters—possibly in frontier wars or in some past extravagances. A great complaint has been made on behalf of our civil servants in India who return to this country from India, that their salaries were calculated on the rupee, which has so very much depreciated in value. But even hon. gentlemen who put forward that argument admitted that the gold which the civil servants got for that rupee had doubled in value. Therefore, the doubling of the purchasing power of the gold is more than equal to the fall in the value of the rupee.

Mr. Everett's motion was then agreed to without a division.

February 28th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SALARIES PAID TO EUROPEANS.

Mr. Naoroji asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any reason to doubt the statement in Return No. 192, of 17th May, 1892, from which the following result was obtained, viz.: that the total amount of annual allowances (whether in the form of salary, pay, fees, emoluments or pensions) of not less than 1,000 rupees for each person, of Europeans, whether resident or not resident in India, was about 170,000,000 rupees (taking payments in sterling at 1s. 1d. per rupee):

And, what was the total amount of similar annual allowances to Europeans, whether resident or not resident in India (including the personal expenditure on soldiers besides their pay), at less than 1,000 rupees for each person?

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The Return of 17th May, 1892, comprises not only payments by the State for the Civil Administration of India, but similar payments for the Military and Public Works Departments, and also the payments made by the railway companies, whether State or guaranteed.

The further information for which my hon. friend asks will probably be called for in the forthcoming inquiry.

THE POLICE AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had sanctioned those provisions of the Indian Police Bill now before the Viceroy's Council, whereby the landlords of any district in which religious or other riots had occurred were liable, at the discretion of the resident magistrate, for the cost of extra police and for the damages caused by the riots, even in cases in which the landlords were absentees, or in which the district judge had held that the landlords had been in no way to blame for the riots:

Whether his attention had been directed to the speech on this subject of the Maharaja of Darbhanga, the first elective member of Council, in which he declared that in native opinion this was a slur on the Judicial authority:

Whether the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal and the Commissioner of the Patna Division of Behar had both opposed the section, on the ground that it might be worked so as to appear to give the victory to the Hindus or to the Muhammadans in cases of religious riots:

Whether the modification of the section consented to by Sir Antony Patrick MacDonnell had satisfied these dissentients:

And, whether the Correspondence on the subject could be laid upon the Table of the House.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The provisions of the Indian Police Bill, as originally introduced, were communicated to me, according to the established practice, by the Government of India; but I have given no opinion upon them.

I have seen the report of the discussions to which the hon. member refers, but I am not as yet aware of the modifications (if any) which have been adopted. As soon as an authentic copy of the measure is sent home, as required by law, I shall give it my careful consideration.

THE MANUFACTURE OF CORDITE.

Mr. Hanbury asked the Secretary of State for India whether the cordite plant sent to India had been successful in producing reliable cordite:

Whether the use of cordite manufactured in India was considered satisfactory by the authorities there:

And would he lay upon the Table any Correspondence thereon.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: (1) So far as I am aware the cordite plant has not yet been erected.

(2) And no cordite has been manufactured in India.

(3) The question as to the manufacture of cordite in India is still under consideration, and I cannot undertake at present to lay the correspondence on the Table of the House.

CHARGES FOR TROOPS.

Mr. Hanbury asked the Secretary of State for India what was the estimated amount in rupees of the charge laid upon the Indian exchequer during the coming financial year for the training of troops in this country, in addition to the cost of the whole of the troops in India itself, and all charges connected with their passage to and from India:

And whether it was intended to reduce this amount, which last year was nearly £600,000.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The capitation rate payable to the War Office for recruiting, depôt, and other charges in respect of the British forces serving in India was fixed by Lord Northbrook's Commission in 1892 at £7 10s. per head. By agreement between the India Office and the Treasury that rate has been continued, and I expect will be maintained during the coming financial year; and the amount would be £548,250.

The question whether the capitation rate should be increased or reduced is one of the matters to be considered in the forthcoming inquiry.

Mr. Hanbury: Has an arbitrator be appointed?

Mr. H. H. Fowler: No, the Government have agreed to appoint a Royal Commission.

COST OF THE INDIA OFFICE.

Mr. Hanbury, asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was the fact that while the Colonial Office cost British taxpayers about £40,000, the Foreign Office about £67,000, and the Treasury about £60,000 annually, the India Office alone, besides the expenses of government in India, cost about £130,000 a year to the India Exchequer:

To whom were the detailed accounts of the India Office presented:

And, whether he would lay upon the Table an Estimate of the Annual Expenses, Salaries, etc., of the India Office similar to those showing the cost of the other Departments of the State.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I cannot admit that there is any analogy between the expenses of the Offices to which the hon. member refers and the expenses of the India Office, which include the Civil and Military Financial, Political, Judicial, and Public Works Departments of the whole Indian Empire.

The accounts are presented to and are audited by the auditor of Indian Home Accounts, and when audited are laid before Parliament.

An estimate of the cost of the Indian Office is annually laid on the Table of the House.

EXPENSES OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

A TARDY ACT OF JUSTICE.

Sir William Wedderburn asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether Her Majesty's Government had been able to reconsider the question of charging a share of the Opium Commission expenses to the Indian revenues.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer: I have considered this subject in all its bearings, and I have come to the conclusion, in conjunction with my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India, that, viewing all the circumstances of the case, I think the cost of the Commission ought to be borne by the English exchequer and not by the Indian Government. The report of the Commission will be among the Supplementary Estimates, which I hope will be laid upon the Table to-night and circulated to-morrow.

March 1st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE GILGHIT AGENCY.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would state what was the total expenditure incurred by the Indian Government in connection with the Gilghit Agency each year since the date of its establishment, including the latest estimate of expenditure during the current year:

And what had been the expenditure of the Kashmir State on the same account during the same period.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I cannot give the information asked for by my hon. friend, but I will ask the Government of India to supply it.

March 4th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE BHOUSLA FUND.

Sir W. Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India, whether at the annexation of Nagpur, the private personal property of the Raja was sold by Government, and converted into a fund of about 29 lakhs of rupees for the maintenance of the family, under the name of the Bhousla Fund:

Whether this fund had been credited to Government without the assent of the Raja:

And, whether the Secretary of State had received a memorial on the subject, addressed to him by the Raja through the Government of India in October last.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The Fund referred to was created in 1854 as part of the arrangements consequent on the lapse of the Nagpur State. It consisted of the proceeds of the sales of jewels and other property; and was intended to provide pensions for the members of the late Court, apart from the special provision made for the father of the present Memorialist.

The fund originally amounted to 29 lakhs, but owing to payments, which had to be made on capital account, this had been reduced to 17 lakhs in 1864. And in that year, as it was clear that the income of the fund was quite insufficient to meet the charges upon it, it was decided to wind it up. The amount of the fund was credited to Government, and the pensions chargeable to it have been since paid from the general revenues of the country.

A memorial from the Raja of Deor, dated 8th September, 1894, dealing with this among other subjects, has been considered by me in Council. The despatch conveying my decision went to India by mail of 1st March; but I may take this opportunity to say that I have declined to interfere in the memorialist's behalf.

THE BHOUSLA PALACE.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the site and remains of the ancient palace of the Bhousla family at Nagpur had, in spite of the Raja's written protest, been recently handed over to the municipality for the purpose of erecting a town hall:

Whether the Government of India had previously declared in writing that the Raja's occupation of the palace would never be disturbed so long as he paid a barley-corn rent, and executed the repairs:

And, whether the Raja had stated his willingness to pay the rent and execute the repairs rendered necessary by an accidental fire.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The information in my possession is to the following effect. In 1862 the then Raja of Deor was informed that the palace, referred to by my hon. friend, belonged to the State, but that he and his relatives would be permitted to occupy it on condition that he kept it in repair and paid a barley-corn rent. The fire referred to in the last paragraph of the question took place in 1864, and the palace was burnt down. With the sanction of the Government of India other arrangements were then made for the accommodation of the Raja and his relatives, a new palace being built on a fresh site which also was State property. At the same time the site of the old palace was declared to be at the disposal of the Government; a part of it was utilised accordingly for the permanent occupation of a normal school. I understand that the site has now been handed over to the municipality for the erection of a town hall.

March 5th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

CRIMEAN AND INDIAN MUTINY PENSIONS.

Major Rasch asked the Secretary of State for War how many Crimean and Mutiny men had applied for the special pension; how many had received it; how many had applied from workhouses; and, if only 180 were granted yearly, how long the last man applying would have to wait.

Sir J. Leng asked the Secretary of State for War whether, having regard to the rapidly diminishing numbers of Crimean and Indian Mutiny veterans, it could be arranged to grant special pensions to all such as were certified to be well-conducted and deserving men in need of assistance, even if not absolutely destitute.

Mr. Woodall: The Secretary of State is in communication with the Treasury on this subject, and he hopes, in making his statement on the introduction of the Army Estimates, to be able to announce to the House the decision arrived at.

March 6th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE COTTON DUTIES.

On the Motion of Mr. J. H. Maden it was agreed to present an address for Copy of Representations made to the Government of India, in March, 1894, against the exclusion of Cotton Manufactures from Import Duties by Chambers of Commerce and other public bodies in India.

March 7th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

A BRITISH DOLLAR.

Mr. Henniker Heaton asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether any modification of the policy of the Government in regard to the proposal for the minting of a British dollar at Bombay, suggested by the hon. member for Canterbury in the House of Commons on the 15th December, 1893, had been made:

And, whether the Government statement on that occasion, that the idea of a British dollar did not appear to have found much favour in the Straits Settlements, and at Hong Kong it had been abandoned, was still adhered to.

Mr. Buxton: The idea of coining a British dollar, after being dropped in Hong Kong at the end of 1893, was revived last year, and Her Majesty's Government have now approved the proposal. Arrangements have been made for issuing the new dollar from the Indian mint for circulation in the Straits Settlements, Hong Kong, Labuan, and North Borneo concurrently with the Mexican dollar. I may add that the question of the coinage of a British dollar has for some years engaged the attention of the Government, but until the Indian Government last year signified their willingness to coin at a uniform rate of 1 per cent. the scheme appeared impracticable.

THE INDIAN ARMY.

Mr. Talbot asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he had any objection to state the number of Officers of the Royal Engineers who would be required for military purposes in the event of the mobilisation of the whole Indian Army.

Sir E. GREY (for Mr. Fowler): The Secretary of State does not consider it would be desirable, in the public interests, to state the number of Officers required on the mobilisation of the Army in India.

THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY WORKS.

Mr. TALBOT asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would agree to the Motion for a Copy of the Report of the Committee on Military Works and Public Works Department, which stood on this day's Paper.

Sir E. GREY (for Mr. Fowler): Neither the Report of the Committee referred to in the hon. member's motion which stands on this day's Paper nor the evidence taken before that Committee have yet been received. The Secretary of State is therefore unable to agree to the motion.

March 11*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MILITARY PENSIONS.

Mr. KIMBER asked the Secretary of State for India whether, notwithstanding rule 17 of the Indian Pensions Regulations, the service out of India of Sub-Lieutenants of the Line, when not antedated, was not allowed to reckon as service for pension in the Indian Staff Corps:

Whether certain Officers of the Marine Light Infantry who failed for the same entrance examination for the Army that the Sub-Lieutenants of the Line passed, and who were subsequently brought into the Indian Staff Corps, thereby superseding the said Sub-Lieutenants, were permitted in all cases to reckon as service for pension two years of their service out of India:

And whether he would recommend to the Indian Government that the service out of Sub-Lieutenants of the Line should in like manner be permitted to count for pension, in conformity with the above mentioned rule.

Sir E. GREY (for Mr. Fowler): Owing to the fact that under the War Office rules service for pension reckons only from date of first permanent commission, the facts are as stated in the hon. member's question. It is not thought desirable to establish a different rule for Indian pensions.

INDIA AND THE NAVY ESTIMATES.

On the motion for going into Committee of Supply on the Navy Estimates,

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER moved a resolution to the effect that the House, before voting supplies for the maintenance of Her Majesty's naval establishments, sought an assurance that the Estimates submitted to it with that object by Her Majesty's Government were based upon a consideration of the needs of possible war by sea and land, and upon the consideration of advice tendered in that behalf by the naval officer selected for the conduct of the naval operations in case of war.

Sir G. CHESNEY seconded the resolution, and in the course of his speech said that for many years, it might be remembered, he advocated unsuccessfully certain reforms in connection with the Indian army, but finally all those reforms were effected. He hoped that the administrative change now proposed would be accepted by the Government without delay. The more that House and the country considered the matter, the stronger would become their conviction that it was a reform which ought to be carried out.

In the course of the subsequent debate,

Sir CHARLES DILKE said that this year we were spending between the land forces and sea forces, including India, something like £58,000,000 sterling, and, with the expenditure of the colonies, the expenditure of the Empire this year on defence would not fall far short of £60,000,000 sterling. That was the highest figure ever reached. That enormous expenditure ought to be justified, not by strict doctrines of Cabinet responsibility, but by very real and personal responsibility on the part of those members of the Cabinet who could afford the time to look into it.

Sir RICHARD TEMPLE said that the hon. member for Oxford (Sir G. Chesney) had suggested that the position of the First Sea Lord should be that of a Member of the Legislative Council of India, who had the power to record his dissent when he differed from the Viceroy, and to have it sent to the Secretary of State. That arrangement answered very well in the Government of India. It left the Viceroy supreme upon the spot, though it placed a check on his action which was especially valuable in the case of Viceroys newly sent out. But that was because the dissent was recorded for the common superior of the Viceroy and the dissenting Member of the Council—for the Secretary of State. There was no House of Commons to be answerable to; and in that was the enormous difference. The First Lord of the Admiralty was answerable to the House of Commons, and if he had a Naval Lord sitting at his side who could place upon record his dissent from the proposals of the Government in the archives of the Admiralty, so that it could be called for by the House of Commons, the position of things would be intolerable for the First Lord of the Admiralty.

The resolution was ultimately negatived without a division.

March 12*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIA AND THE BRITISH NAVY.

In Committee of Supply on the Navy Estimates,

Mr. E. ROBERTSON concluded his general statement as to the condition of the Navy as follows: I have only one word to say in conclusion. I alluded, I hope in no spirit which may be taken amiss by the noble lord (Lord G. Hamilton) and hon. gentlemen opposite, to the Naval Defence Act, for which they were responsible, but there has always seemed to me to be a great defect in that Act—it is a defect of spirit rather than of structure—namely, the distrust and want of confidence that the policy displayed in the House of Commons. Sir, I have never been one of those who doubted the House of Commons. If I had been the events of this short Session would have reassured me. Already this House has read in the great Indian debate of two or three weeks ago—which I refer to with no party animus whatever—a memorable lesson to all its detractors. (Hear, hear.) On that occasion, neglecting party interests, neglecting party considerations and provincial interests, it rose to the full height of its Imperial responsibilities. (Cheers.) Sir, it is in reliance on that sound and, I believe, abiding instinct, that I now beg, on behalf of the Admiralty and the Government, to submit these Estimates to the favourable consideration of the Committee. (Cheers.)

In the course of the subsequent debate,

Mr. FORWOOD said that he did not see any reference in the Estimates, moreover, to the contributions from India this year. In the last three or four years £100,000 had been taken as an appropriation in aid expected to be received from the Government of India as part contribution towards the cost of the fleet which this country maintained in Indian waters. It had always appeared right and proper to him that the Indian revenues should contribute a reasonable sum towards the protection of the shores and the revenues of India. He had enquired into this matter, and he was satisfied that the Government of India would be obtaining the services of the ships on the Indian station at a very moderate cost for the £115,000 or £120,000 claimed by the Imperial Government. This subject was under friendly arbitration three years ago and he thought that plenty of time had elapsed to allow the subject to be concluded, and to let it be known what the Indian Government were to pay towards the cost of the fleet.

March 13*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE MANUFACTURE OF CORDITE.

In the discussion in Committee of Supply on the Supplementary Vote for Ordnance Factories,

Mr. HANBURY, criticising the Vote generally, said that the position of affairs as regarded the manufacture of cordite was extremely unsatisfactory. It appeared that Waltham Abbey was the only place where at present it could be made. Some time ago plant was sent out to India for the purpose of making cordite there, but he believed that the manufacture had not been carried on. At any rate he should like to know whether the attempt to make cordite in India had failed.

When, later on, Mr. WOODALL replied on the debate, he made no reference to Mr. Hanbury's enquiry.

March 14th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

AVERAGE INCOME IN INDIA.

Mr. **Naoroji** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, to ascertain the correctness of Lord Cromer's statement of 1882 about the annual average income per head, and to show whether the people of British India were improving or becoming worse in their material condition, he would grant the return for which a motion stood on this day's Paper:

And whether, if he be unwilling to grant as a return the details of Lord Cromer's calculations, as asked in the first part of the motion, he would give an opportunity to the hon. member for Finsbury of personally inspecting them.

Sir E. **Grey**: Considering that the statement to which my hon. friend refers was confessedly founded upon uncertain data, and that any similar calculation which might now be made must be founded on equally uncertain data and might probably be misleading, the Secretary of State is unable to agree to my hon. friend's motion.

THE CURRENCY AND TRADE UNIONS.

Mr. **Howell** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that the Amalgamated Society of Engineers had branches of that union in British India:

Whether he was aware that the society periodically equalises its funds, and that, in so equalising the funds of the union, in the transmission from Bombay of the sum required, £153, to the Greenock Branch, there was a loss by exchange of £73 19s. 5½d., or within £5 0s. 1d. of one-half the total:

And whether anything could be done so to adjust the currency of British India and the United Kingdom as to prevent such losses.

Sir E. **Grey**: There is no information in the India Office as to the matters to which my hon. friend's question refers; but it is unfortunately true that losses upon remittances from India have occurred and do occur, and no measures for preventing them have hitherto been found practicable.

A SUBSIDIZED NEWSPAPER.

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of the North-West Provinces and Oudh subscribed for sixty-two copies of the *Punjab Patriot*, a newspaper published outside these provinces; and, if so, why this expense was incurred out of provincial revenues:

And whether the same Government had established a monopoly of printing judicial forms in favour of the "Newal Kishore" press; and, if so, for what reason.

Sir E. **Grey**: Similar questions were asked in the Council of the Lieutenant-Governor on the 21st January last, and the Secretary of State has nothing to add to the answers there given as reported in the North-West Provinces and Oudh *Gazette* for 26th January, 1895.

TRANS-FRONTIER AGGRESSION.

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India whether there was any intention of moving the garrisons now at Dera Ghazi Khan and other neighbouring frontier stations into the Waziri territory beyond the Suleiman Range.

Sir E. **Grey**: Some redistribution of garrisons on the North-Western frontier will no doubt be necessary, but the Secretary of State has reason to think that the Government of India have not yet finally decided on the course which they will recommend.

THE HOME CHARGES.

"EXCESSIVE AND UNJUST TO INDIA."

On the motion to go into Committee of Supply on the Army Estimates,

Mr. **Hanbury** rose to call attention to the large appropriations-in-aid contributed out of the Indian Exchequer, and to move that the military appropriations-in-aid paid by India, in addition to the payment by that country of the cost of the British army in India, and of its transport to and from India, are excessive and unjust to India. The home military charges appearing on these Estimates consisted of two classes. First, *matériel*—that was to say, stores supplied to India; and, secondly, *personnel*, troops actually paid for by India to this country. From the manner in which the Estimates were presented, it was impossible to find out to which army the charges ought to be apportioned, whether to the British troops in India or to the native troops in India, but, after making all proper allowances, there remained upon the Estimates for men alone the large appropriation in aid of £1,350,000, which was actually expended by India on account of troops actually in England. That sum was increased by the loss on exchange to the extent of about three-fifths, and, of course, in tens of rupees amounted to a very considerable sum indeed. In the next place, it had to be remembered that the whole of this sum was spent in England—that was to say, it was a sum going out of India and wholly spent in England, and that, too, without India having any control whatever over it. For the expenditure of this money, even the Secretary of State for India, sitting in this House, was in no sense responsible. That was a very serious state of things; and the mischief was increased when one recollected that this sum, over a million and a quarter sterling a year, was exclusive of what India paid for the troops when they were in India itself. The amount might be divided into two portions—one for the non-effective, and the other for the effective services. India paid £548,000 a year for effective services, and over £800,000 for non-effective services in this country. Both those charges had been bitterly complained of, not only by the people of India, but by long successions of Viceroys and Commanders-in-Chief in India, and even Secretaries of State in this country. In the Cabinet, however strong a Secretary of State might be, there were two men whom he had to fight persistently, whose interests were diametrically opposed to his, and who represented a different class of taxpayers—the Secretary of State for War and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. And, in addition, it was a difficult matter for the Secretary of State even to fight the House of Commons itself, because every penny the House of Commons could throw on the Indian Exchequer was money saved to this country. Altogether he was bound to say it was a very bad system. It was a system opposed to anything that went on in this country. Not only did they not contribute a single penny of this money, but the House of Commons, on the contrary, seemed to endeavour to shift as much of the burden as was possible upon India. He had not brought forward the motion from philanthropic motives, but his attention had been directed to this Vote entirely by his constituents, who represented that it was, to a great extent, a Lancashire question. The people of Lancashire felt that a great number of these appropriations-in-aid and charges which fell upon India were charges which might fairly be borne by the Imperial Government, and the result of the Imperial Government not bearing them was that a deficit was created in the Indian Exchequer which was supplied by import duties, which Lancashire had to pay. The non-effective Vote amounted to £810,000. Roughly speaking, that sum might be divided into £300,000 to officers, which was almost entirely for retired pay and compensation on the abolition of purchase, and the remaining £500,000 was in connection with out-pensions to men. With regard to the latter, he had been able to get no information whatever as to how this large amount fell upon India. It struck him that in these days of short service, when pensions were becoming rarer, it was a peculiar thing that the pensions which India had to pay should be increasing in number each year. He would also observe that no non-effective charge had ever been placed upon any country connected with England, except India itself. Then, again, there had been a most enormous increase in the non-effective charges. Up to the year 1822, although India maintained 20,000 British troops, the non-effective charge in respect of those troops in England was absolutely nothing whatever. Then in 1822 no charge was effected, and the British East India Company made an arrangement with the Government at home by which the non-effective charge was to be fixed at £60,000. That arrangement continued up to the time when the Crown took over India from the East India Company, since when the charges had grown from year to year by leaps and bounds. Not only had there been this enormous increase, but they found an Ex-Viceroy like Lord Northbrook, speaking in another place, only two years ago, declaring that although since 1861 endeavours had been made almost every year to arrive at some fair and permanent settlement between this country and India as to what those charges ought to be, no such settlement had yet been arrived at. In 1861, soon after the Crown took over India from the East India Company, another arrangement was made in respect to the non-effective charges, which had hitherto been £60,000 a year, but which were then fixed at £3 10s. per head. He was not quite sure whether the £3 10s. was on the one-third of the whole non-effective service, which would be a fair proportion for India, or whether it was on the whole non-effective services. If it was on the whole the charge formerly would be £315,000, but if on one-third, which was his contention, it meant that the non-effective Vote was formerly only £105,000, as against £810,000 in the present year. Then came further changes. They had, in the first place, the abolition of purchase, which very slightly affected the Indian army, but of course India had to pay for that. Then they had the compulsory retirement of officers at an early age, which was a purely English matter, but India had to bear its share of that. In addition, in 1870 an alteration was made in the mode of assessing India's fair share of these pensions. Speaking on this latter subject, Lord Northbrook said:- "In 1870 a most complicated and extraordinary plan was imposed upon India under which, year by year, the actual pensions India was supposed to be called upon to pay in India in consequence of the abolition of purchase in the British Army was capitalised, and the capital value year by year was charged upon India by the British Exchequer." The result of that was that by 1884 the charges had reached the very large sum at which they stood at the present moment. Lord Northbrook, in 1892, stated that, though the arrangement for the capitalisation of the purchase pensions ceased in 1884, he had no materials in his possession (though he had acted as chairman of the Committee which had been appointed on the subject in 1872) as to what had happened since then. He (Mr. Hanbury), without going into any question of arithmetic as to these charges, argued that they ought to listen to the views of ex-Viceroys, Commanders-in-chief, and Indian Secretaries, who had persistently stated that it was absolutely unjust that India should have to bear so very large a proportion of pensions and charges as were thrown upon her Exchequer simply and solely in connection with such changes as the abolition of purchase and the compulsory retirement of officers, which did not affect the interests of India at all, but were entirely and absolutely English matters. He would call attention to what had been said on the question by members of the present Government and others who were entitled to speak with authority. Lord Ripon said: "The argument as regards the abolition of the purchase system appears to be particularly strong. It certainly appears to me exceedingly unjust that the Indian revenue should be called upon to bear any charge in order to get rid of this peculiarly English matter." Lord Kimberley, speaking on the same subject, said: "Part of the increase was incurred owing to measures carried into effect by the English Government for purposes unconnected with India, such as the abolition of the purchase system, and the compulsory retirement of officers." Lord Northbrook stated that, after sitting for fourteen years upon this Committee, he had found it utterly impossible for that Committee, hampered as it was by the Treasury, to go into the real questions that were at the bottom of these payments, and, because of this he threw up his appointment in disgust. The result, as Lord Northbrook said, was "that after fourteen years' work the main contention had not been considered, but was altogether put on one side; the main question after twenty years had been utterly and entirely ignored, and the difficulty remained." That was a strong statement for such a man as Lord Northbrook to make. He now wished to refer to the effective vote, which amounted to £548,000. And here again he had in the first place to complain of the way in which the Estimates were presented. It was most misleading. The Vote was described as "payment by the Indian Government in respect of home effective charges (other than deferred pay) for the regular forces serving in India." Anyone reading this would suppose that the money was for forces serving in India; but the fact was, that the charge had nothing whatever to do with such service. This money thus charged upon India was actually expended upon our home garrisons, upon troops actually serving in England, and available at any moment for the defence of England. The charges were placed under different Votes, and the Estimates were presented in such a way that it was difficult to understand them and to ascertain what the charges really were. How was the charge for the effective service arrived at? It was the payment for the Indian drafts, for troops going out to India every year. He did not know what the amount of the Indian drafts was, but as the troops in India were, roughly speaking, something like 70,000, and they stayed out in India for five years, the average number of the drafts was probably about 14,000 or 15,000. It was upon that that the Estimate ought to be based, but if they based it upon the number of troops going out to India every year, they would get a payment in this country of £40 per man per year, for men who had never been out in India at all, and were actually serving in the garrisons of this country. At present the Estimate was presented in a most misleading form, but he did not blame his right hon. friend the Secretary for War, because the system had gone on for years, and one minister was as responsible for it as another. How was this shown in the Estimates? Not as a charge of £40 for every man connected with the drafts which would ultimately go to India, but, as Lord Northbrook had said, from the moment every man was recruited in England; and India paid his passage out and we paid it home. Although India paid for everything connected with him in India, yet we forced upon the Indian Government all the expenses of a man forming a draft from the time he was recruited. Such a thing was monstrous. They were told that it was a capitation grant of £7 10s. per head on the 73,000 troops serving in India, but what could be the connection between the payment of these men serving in England and the capitation grant in respect of the 73,000 men serving in India? Most of those men formed important portions of our own home garrisons, and a large number of them were at Aldershot before they went out to India. Not only did we lay those heavy charges upon India, but we were so interfering in the legislation of India at the present moment with regard to troops which she had to maintain at her own cost, that if they accepted the statement of Sir George White, the Commander-in-Chief in India, the charges upon India in respect of her troops would be very largely increased, and larger drafts would have to be sent out. He wished to refer to something which one did not like to dwell upon, and it was the forcing of this something by that House upon India that would necessitate an addition of thousands of troops to those now serving in India, and the fact that one-third of the troops were invalided had led the Commander-in-Chief to point out how dangerous it would be in case of war if we had to depend upon these troops, decimated by disease as they were. Not only did we place these charges upon India, but fads too, and the result would be larger drafts, perhaps of 20,000 men or more from England, and he wished to know whether, in the event of such an increase the Government would still continue the iniquitous system of which he was complaining. It must be recollected that the troops only served five years in India. In that case England profited by seven years out of their twelve years service. It had also been said that we had the recruiting and the training of these men, but if we come to the question of training, the balance was on the side of India. We certainly owed a great deal to India for the training our troops received in India, and for the experience our generals derived there from moving troops upon a large scale, which was much more beneficial than any mere barrack drill we could teach in England. It was further said that the troops in this country acted as a reserve for India, but, looking at all the facts, he ventured to think that the balance was again on the side of India. If our troops went out to India, India paid for them; and for cases of emergency outside India not only had we drawn upon them, but also upon the native Indian army to fight our battles, and in that case India had to bear the whole burden. The more they looked at these Indian military charges the more unjust they appeared to be. The injustice was all the greater when we compared the treatment of India with the treatment which our Colonies received. He referred to non-effective charges, and did not think that any other dependency of England had ever been called upon to bear them. India received distinctive treatment in this respect. In Halifax, for instance, 1,487 troops were stationed, costing £126,000 a year, but not one penny was that Colony asked to pay towards the cost. Then again, there was the case of the Cape, which occupied a somewhat different position from Natal. We had always had troops at the Cape and at Natal, and up to two years ago Natal was not a self-governing Colony to the extent it was now. There were 3,679 troops at the Cape and Natal, the larger proportion being at the Cape. What happened? Not one farthing was charged to Cape Colony, because it was self-governing and would have resisted the charge; but £4,000 was charged on Natal, because it was not a self-governing Colony and had not the same power of resistance. They ought to apply the same principle to India. What were the facts with regard to the Crown Colonies? The troops in Ceylon cost £109,453, and Ceylon paid £81,750; in Hong Kong they cost £167,484, and the Colony contributed £40,000; in Maritius they cost £66,212, and the Colony paid £14,700. Again, take the case of Egypt. We had spent large sums of British money upon barracks in Egypt, while in India, our own possession, we had spent something like ten or fifteen millions out of the revenues of that country on barracks for British troops. But, apart from that question, the cost of the troops in Egypt was £283,000, and all that Egypt paid over was £87,000. India had to pay for arms, accoutrements, barrack, hospital, and other stores, recruiting expenses at home, headquarters, administration expenses, the cost of sea transport, and non-effective charges; but not one of these charges was placed on Egypt or the Colonies. Lord Northbrook had stated that the very largest amount that ought to be paid by India was £5 a head, but whether the charge was £5 or £7 10s. some definite arrangement ought to be come to; it was not fair to India that we should go on in this haphazard way. He had raised the question in spite of the fact that a Committee had been promised by the Secretary of State for India for dealing with the whole question of the Indian Home Charges, because if the facts of the last thirty or fifty years proved anything, they proved that these Commissions and Committees were of no use whatever to India. The history of these Commissions and Committees formed a very curious chapter in the history of our national life. In 1874 a Committee of which Mr. Fawcett was a member reported that charges had been imposed upon India which ought to be borne by England, and agreed with Lord Salisbury's statement that the most effectual way of securing financial justice to India was for the House of Commons to be constantly watchful on her behalf. How could they be watchful when the facts presented were so utterly misleading, that no one, unless he went very carefully into the matter, could judge of their real character? In 1875 another Committee was appointed, over which Mr. Bouverie presided. That Committee made certain recommendations as to the cost of the troops; but, although they felt strongly upon the question of policy, they could say nothing, because their hands were tied by the terms of reference. No agreement on these charges was come to until the Public Accounts' Committee intervened in 1878, and declared that some definite arrangement must be made. In that year the present Lord Derby, then Secretary to the Treasury, admitted that India had been charged a great deal too much in respect of these military charges. The Commission of which Lord Northbrook was chairman was appointed in 1879. But it was not until 1886 that they could get any accounts. A long despatch was received from the Government of India, in which they took up the position that, while on the mere question of arithmetic the charges were too high, this matter ought to be treated as one of policy. This despatch was handed to the Commission by the Secretary to the Treasury with an intimation that the Government had already considered the question, and had made up its mind with regard to the question of policy. Two or three years afterwards, Lord Northbrook, finding it impossible to effect any real financial alteration, threw up his position as chairman of the Committee in disgust. This case had been admitted by a long succession of Viceroys, Commanders-in-Chief, and Secretaries of State. The present Secretary of State the other evening said that, although he would not admit that in regard to the ordinary home charges, he must admit that in regard to these military home charges there was a case. This view had been endorsed by Committee after Committee and Commission after Commission, and now they had the same offer made—that the matter should be again referred to a Commission. If this were a question of policy, the members representing the India Office, the War Office, and the Treasury were perfectly able to deal with it; if it was a question of administration and of detail, then the staff of these departments could cope with it. But Committees and Commissions were too often appointed to drive off the real issue and avoid a decision. That had gone on a great deal too long. Indeed, it had been our practice ever since India was taken over by the Crown. He was quite sure the people of this country did not want to levy any undue charges upon India. He had confined himself entirely to the military charges actually appearing upon the Estimates, and had said nothing about the large appropriations-in-aid outside of these Estimates; but he thought he had been able to show that the charges made upon India in respect of them were most scandalous and unjustifiable. He could not understand upon what principle of justice India, after having defrayed the cost of the troops going out and coming home, should be called upon to pay the additional sum of £600,000. It was time for Government to face this question, and not to run away from it by proposing a Commission. It was the interests of his Lancashire constituents in this question which first induced him to bring it forward, and he was quite sure that if Lancashire and India worked together every English and Scotch member, feeling that the question touched their purses or their honour, would unite in seeing that this long-standing evil was put an end to, and would set to work to remedy it.

Sir R. Temple, in rising to second the motion, complimented the member for Preston upon his interesting argument. About two years ago he had himself drawn the attention of the right hon. minister to the injustice of placing upon India the army purchase charges and the retirement charges. He first remembered it when sitting at Calcutta on a Military and Finance Commission in conjunction with Sir George Balfour. Ever since that time the subject had been urged by almost every European and Native authority throughout India; and, although something had been done, there still remained a very heavy residue of charge against India. He thought that his hon. friend the member for Preston deserved well of the people of India for bringing the subject forward in this authoritative way. As his hon. friend had never served in the East, no suggestion of prejudice could be made in regard to his action. The real gist of the matter lay in the effective charge. It was a question of recruits. The English argument, as he understood it in former days in India, was this: "We are sending you out a made soldier; we have spent a good deal of money upon his training, of which you in India get the advantage. Therefore, we in England are entitled to some compensation from India." That was the English army view, to which the Indian reply was as follows: "No doubt we get a made soldier who has been trained at some cost to you; but, while he has been training, he has been borne on the regiment and has served as an effective portion of the garrison in England, and, if war had broken out, would have formed an effective portion of the forces for England's national defence. During that time he has been of use and value to England, and England has received the value of her outlay upon him." That had always been, and always would be, India's argument until this matter was redressed. The grievance was increased by the absurd way in which the charge was disguised in the Estimates. Nobody who could not read between the lines or see behind the scenes could understand the manner in which the charge was made. Instead of stating the charge as £40 or £50 a head on the men sent out, it was put down as a capitation grant on the whole 70,000 or 80,000 men in India, and in this form it did not look so much. In regard to the transport charges for the reliefs, no complaint could, perhaps, be made on account of the cost of taking the men out being charged to India, but that country was also saddled with the entire cost of bringing the men home. India had always contended that the men coming back were valuable to the English Army—coming back as they did in many cases, to service in their own country, and that the cost of bringing them back, ought, therefore, to be borne by England. Another growing grievance, which was becoming most seriously noticed in India, was in relation to the new Cantonment Regulations, the result of which had been an enormous increase in disease. These men, who were our own flesh and blood, were being decimated by disease. The new Regulations were entirely owing to the action of the House, and he would not be doing his duty as a member of that House if he did not call attention to the fact, though he was thankful that he and some other hon. members had purged themselves from responsibility for this awful result. The return of Sir George White mentioned one-third, but he was afraid that one-half of the men were suffering from disease, which might easily have been made preventable, and which was effectually prevented until the House interfered from a false sense of morality. If war broke out in India it might be necessary to send out a whole fresh army corps to repair the ravages caused by the disease. Morality had benefited not at all. India was placed under heavy additional charges in deference to Lord Roberts and other authorities, and yet all that was entirely nullified by having 30,000 or 40,000 men diseased, owing to the new Regulations. Every military officer in India was dead against these Regulations, which had also received the protests of the Council and others. They should not be doing their duty to their fellow-subjects in India if they hesitated to speak out. Their speaking out might possbly give offence to some, but they acted under a grievous misapprehension. They had been the means of inflicting great evils on their fellow-countrymen—evils which would last not for a year or two but probably for a lifetime. Now, if the House chose to interfere they ought to pay the bill, and not cast on others the cost of these moral vagaries. He hoped he might be excused for having spoken so earnestly on this question. He had spoken from the bottom of his heart, because he knew exactly how this evil had come about. The House should look favourably upon these financial questions, because he could assure them that the feelings of the natives of India were very keen on this subject. He urged hon. members opposite, who had shown so much generous consideration towards the feelings and sentiments and the wishes of the natives of India, to try and get a reduction of these charges. It would be a most gracious thing if the Government saw their way to take these charges in hand, and thus extend a helping hand to India in the hour of her financial difficulties.

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman said he had a very strong sympathy with the two speeches to which they had just listened. He thoroughly agreed that every consideration ought to be shown to the interests of India, and, above all, that that House should be most careful that, sometimes without intending it, it did not infringe upon those interests. They all knew how apt the House was sometimes to be carried away by most praiseworthy, philanthropic, and excellent motives, but he agreed with his hon. friend that there had been occasions when the House, acting under the influence of these motives, had placed burdens of one sort or another on India which that country ought not to bear. Having listened to the very strong repudiation of his hon. friend who had just sat down of any desire to interfere with the wishes and feelings of the people of India in an unnecessary way, he might assume, though his memory did not enable him to be confident, that he was one of those who voted for the retention of the Cotton Duties. He was so fastidious that he was sure his hon. friend would never have countenanced for a moment any action on the part of the Government which would have even the appearance of injuring Indian interests. He presumed his hon. friend voted for the retention of the Cotton Duties in accordance with the desire of the people of India.

Sir R. Temple: Alas! I voted on the other side.

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman admitted his mistake. They had listened to a very strong speech from the member for Preston, but his speech was stronger than the foundation on which it was built. He did not think that his hon. friend, who had just awoke somewhat tardily to the circumstances, could have informed himself very well of the facts. One of his strong points—and here he was joined by the member for Richmond—was that it was a monstrous thing they should make the people of India pay for the abolition of purchase in the army. They were told that, from the British point of view, the abolition of purchase might have been a good thing, but the Indian people cared nothing about it. How monstrous to make them pay? Would the House believe that from first to last India did not pay a single penny in respect of the abolition of purchase?

Mr. Hanbury referred to Vote 14: "Retired pay and gratuities, including compensation awarded by the Army Purchase Commissioners;" "sum to be received in aid of Army Estimates to meet the non-effective charges for the Regular Forces serving in India."

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman said that was very true, and he admitted that was a misleading heading and ought not to be there; but the House might take it from him, with regard to the abolition of purchase, none of the charge had ever been placed on the revenue of India. Then his hon. friend quoted from the speech of Lord Northbrook in the other House. He was not going to attack or defend Lord Northbrook. He was an old friend of his; but of all people entitled to complain of delay Lord Northbrook was the last, because he was at the head of the Committee which had investigated these home charges. Then his hon. friend said that Lord Northbrook threw the post up in disgust. It was the first he had heard of it, and it was the first those who sat on the Committee had heard of it. His hon. friend also found a great grievance in the arrangement with regard to the non-effective charges. The Committee had nothing to do with the non-effective charges; and let him tell the House that the Government of India never raised any objection to the manner in which the non-effective charges had been settled. His hon. friend said as to pensions he could not understand how the figure was arrived at; all he knew was it was going up by leaps and by bounds. Why, the method was a very simple and, in his view, a very just one. When a soldier went to pension his services were examined, and India paid its share of that pension for the proportion of his service spent in India. This country paid for the portion of time which the soldier spent at home, which included the earliest days of his infancy. That could not be considered an injurious arrangement. Some time ago his prospective pension was capitalised, and that sum was divided between the two Governments on the terms he had stated. But now a still more exact method was adopted. When a soldier was to be pensioned, there was taken what might be called his "horoscope"—that was to say, they estimated how long he ought to live, and, having found the time he ought to live, they charged his pension. The proportion for the years spent in India was charged to the Indian Government. If the man died too soon India lost; if he lived too long this country lost; but, on the whole, the "horoscope," being calculated on undoubted tables, there was a perfectly equitable distribution of this charge. This was an instance of one of those terrible evils which the hon. member for Preston was so apt to discover—where some person in one of the offices was endeavouring to mislead him and everyone else who looked into the estimates; and he could not understand where this mystery arose. The hon. member said that pensions had increased. They had increased because the whole system of pensions had increased. One of the principal reasons for the introduction twenty-five years ago of the short system was the intolerable amount of pensions which long service had in prospect for this country. The pension list had gone up in the same way as the other, because the Government could not break faith with those who served under the old long service system, and so long as these men retired on pension the Government must fulfil their engagements to them; this was the sole reason why there was this great increase in pensions. He had seen it stated, as one of the grievances of India, that she had suffered so much by the introduction of short service. According to an actuarial calculation, it was shown that under short service the decrease on the home charges to India was no less than £390,000 a year. The main point, however, was what was called home charges for training and preparing. Not only as a member of Parliament but as head of the War Office, he said that this country ought to behave generously to India. His contention was, that we did behave generously to India, and it would be an evil day for India if her short-sighted advocates were to come forward and to urge her to claim her pound of flesh; because if India did so then this country would be obliged to claim its pound of flesh; and he thought our pound of flesh would be considerably heavier than that of India. He had some familarity with these subjects, because more than twenty years ago he sat for two or three years on a Committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Ayrton—Mr. Fawcett being one of the members. The same thing was discussed then, and the point they differed upon was—what were to be the relations between the two countries? If they once settled that point, then the whole matter became comparatively easy. In those days they were always told how cheaply the Indian Government had managed its military affairs in the old days before the Mutiny. They were also told that India in those days got its recruits with great ease, that they cost India very little, that there was an admirable supply, and that India maintained its own troops in a state of great efficiency. But those were the Presidency troops, which were very few in number; and the system pursued then was to send out from the depôt 800 or 1,000 men yearly. There was not, however, much consideration shown to a recruit in those days. A recruit was captured, perhaps, within two or three months of embarcation, and he was packed off with others to take a voyage round the Cape—untrained men for the most part, though learning a little of the goose step in the course of their long voyage. The Government had been advised many years ago by the Sanitary Commission that it ought not, in justice to the soldiers, to send a young man out to India until he was at least twenty years of age and trained. What happened to the men who were sent out in this manner? The best medical authorities agreed in saying that after eight years the soldier deteriorated in health in India. Therefore the Government had fixed eight years as the extreme time that a soldier was to be kept in India. But the poor men who went out from the depôt at home to the little Presidency armies were kept there until they either died or were sent home in an exhausted state to die in this country. The Government preferred to send men out at the age best suited for their health, and to bring them back in a sound condition of health, and that was why the expense of the recruits for Indian purposes was so much greater than it was in those earlier days. Then there were the Queen's troops. Every battalion in India had a depôt company for each battalion at home. It was on the Indian establishment; it was paid by India; it was at one time not even voted in the numbers of the Estimates in this House. If hon. members could conceive that system being applied to the 70,000 men that India now had, was it likely that there would be very much gain in the cost that India would incur? The hon. member quoted the fact that £10 was allowed about thirty years ago for all arms per man. In order to show the concession that involved in India—a concession far beyond what was equitable to this country—he drew the attention of the hon. member to the fact that the Committee of Investigation presided over by Sir Alexander Tulloch recommended a capitation rate to keep up the forces in India at the rate, for an infantry soldier, of £11 1s. 6d.; cavalry soldier, £15 16s.; artillery soldier, £23 13s. Yet the Government, out of consideration for the circumstances of India, accepted £10. He thought that this fact showed that there had not been on the part of this country any desire to deal in the unfair way sometimes represented with India. But that was not quite a scientific basis on which to base the arrangement, and their efforts had been since directed to attain that. There was, first, an inquiry held under the auspices of the late Mr. Sclater-Booth, and then Lord Northbrook; and finally a provisional settlement was made of £7 10s. on the strength of the forces in India. This sum had been taken, and it had been continued from year to year. It was built up on a certain calculation of the expenses, and the point which the House would have to consider and to ask was, whether this £7 10s. for a man in India was necessary. He would state the War Office view of what ought to be paid equitably by this country. India should pay the extra cost of the numbers on the establishment, which would not be maintained if the Indian army had not to be kept up. It might be said on the one hand: "Oh! morally to set off against that you should look at the advantage you get from the experience in India of the officers and men—the reservoir of force you have in that country." On the other hand, he put this question, which he thought would involve a much larger sum: "Supposing we had not to maintain the forces in India, what would be the effect on our arms at home?" If England had not this great duty of maintaining the garrison of India, it would be possible to adopt an organisation for our army which would be adequate for all purposes of home defence and yet effect an enormous saving on the present establishment. He set that fact off as at least equal to the supposed benefit derived by this country from the existence of a portion of the army under excellent conditions for training and experience in India. The War Office had to obtain its recruits young, and the recruit, who was only drafted in the autumn of the year, could not be sent out under 21 years of age. Therefore the home establishment had to keep the recruit for 18 months or two years before he could be sent to India, and during that time he was not of much service for army purposes. In case of war he would not be used; the War Office would make use of the Reserve; and the hon. member had not mentioned that India did not pay one penny of the existing Reserve. In respect of these infantry recruits, whom the War Office kept for 18 months, India was charged only for six months' pay and maintenance at the depôt and with the regiment. Then India was charged with only one-fifth of the staff of the depôt. The depôts were maintained for militia, volunteer, home army, and training purposes, and the expense of the staff was divided into five parts, with one of which India was charged. That was certainly not too much, and in the old days India would have had to pay, instead of one-fifth, the whole of one company. India was charged nothing for the staff of the regiment, although, if it were conceivable that any other system should be adopted, India would have to maintain a separate staff of her own. Something was charged for educational establishments; but why not? India received the benefit of the educated officer, and she ought to pay a share, not too great, but in proportion to the services of the officers. Some of these educational establishments were very costly. India, again, paid a share of the hospitals and discharge depôts, some of which were maintained almost entirely for herself, and there were some other smaller charges. If the total cost which, equitably enough, could be charged in respect of these recruits were assessed, it would not be the £600,000 asked for now, but over a million. The Home Government gladly and cheerfully remitted nearly one-half of that million. But as partners in this great undertaking surely India and the Home Government should each bear their own share. Neither the present Government nor any Minister at the War Office or the Treasury ever wanted India to pay one *sou* more than it was right to ask of her. But, on the other hand, it was not right that the Home Government should calmly endure the imposition upon the taxpayers of this country of a greatly increased payment in those matters where the cost could be actually ear-marked and charged to Indian purposes alone. Lord Northbrook was a consenting party to this payment. He was the chairman of the Committee who recommended it. This £7 10s. rate was not the choice of the Home Government. The Indian Government themselves stated that they preferred it. The War Office would, for many purposes, have rather had a fixed sum independent of the strength of India. It was necessary to explain that this was not a plot and scheme to defraud India by imposing on her expenditure what she ought not to pay. Some of the charges which he had mentioned might be too extravagant, while others might be inadequate. He should have thought that, this matter having dragged along for some years under the Northbrook Committee, the proposal which the Secretary of State for India made was a reasonable one—namely, that there should be an inquiry into these charges in order to have some sort of a settlement and understanding as to the proper sum to be charged. He believed such an inquiry would be most useful; but he was satisfied that it would not be very favourable, at all events, to Indian finance. The whole position was governed by this consideration—that while the Government were anxious to save India from any expense of which she could with any justice complain, they were not prepared to make what would be practically a contribution in aid of Indian revenues, on the ground of these charges, which they believed, and which had been proved to be, just and equitable.

Sir George Chesney said that on both sides the canon had been laid down that in dealing with India in this matter—in which we were the final arbiter—our stand should be taken on the ground of generosity. It was admitted that it was very hard to define and fix an absolute rule on which these charges should be based, and it was urged that, wherever there was a doubt, generosity should be exercised to the benefit of India. [Mr. Campbell-Bannerman: Hear, hear.] He would mention one case in illustration of this principle of generosity. It had been accurately stated, that when troops were sent to India every possible charge which could be made out in respect of those troops was debited to India.

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman: My hon. and gallant friend misrepresents me. I distinctly implied that it was not every possible charge which could be made out. I mentioned the charges which were included, but there are many others which could be made.

Sir G. Chesney said that he would take the responsibility for the statement himself. He believed that every possible charge which could in propriety be made was made in India. From the day the soldier left England his pay was borne by the Indian Government.

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman: His pay outward is borne by us.

Sir G. Chesney said that, on the other hand, the soldier's pay was borne by the Indian Government on his return; and if he went into hospital on reaching England, he was charged on the Indian Government till he recovered. But when India lent troops to England a very different system of accounts was adopted. Frequently of late years India had been called upon to assist, by her forces and establishment, the Imperial forces in expeditions to various parts of the world—such as Abyssinia, the South Seas, Malta, and Cyprus. Was the pay of the troops employed on these expeditions charged to the home Government? Not at all. It was argued with a certain degree of plausibility that the Indian troops were only temporarily employed by the home Government, and that they would have to be maintained by India in any case; and, therefore, while England paid the extra expenses of transport and clothing, the allowances and pay of the officers and men was still borne by India. There might be some reason for this, but he failed to see where the generosity came in. As we were the final authority, and as the system had been frequently protested against by the Indian Government, it would be seen that the high canon of practice laid down by the right hon. gentleman was not always very carefully observed. It was, perhaps, a small matter in the long run; but undoubtedly it rankled in the minds of the Indian people as a piece of high-handed injustice.

Mr. PHILIP J. STANHOPE said that he must accept the reproach of the Secretary for War for having been but tardily awakened to the importance of this subject. The hon. member for Preston, the right hon. baronet who sat by his side, and himself, were members of a Committee which sat regularly upon those accounts, and they had failed unfortunately to discover the points which the right hon. gentleman said they ought to have discovered. These Estimates were extremely difficult to understand. One of the very headings in the Estimates, which dealt with the compensation for purchase in India, the right hon. gentleman himself admitted to be a misleading heading, and therefore it was extremely difficult for an unfortunate private member like himself to arrive at the real facts.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN pointed out that if it was misleading, it was against themselves, and not in the other direction.

Mr. STANHOPE said they had been told the other day by the Secretary of State for India that they were, one and all of them, members for India, and he would add that they were anxious to do justice to the people of India. They had had occasion the other day to give a vote by which they wished to do justice to the people of India. Successive Viceroys of India had called attention to what they thought were the extremely inequitable charges thrown upon the people of India by these votes; and, although it was impossible for anyone not in possession of War Office secrets to follow all the details of the non-effective charges, when they came to the effective home charges he thought they must admit that the right hon. gentleman entirely failed to establish his case on behalf of the Government. It had been stated, and it could not be denied, that we dealt out different measures to India and to the great colonies. When the responsible government of a colony was able to make the desires of the people of that colony felt, then they did not find the War Office entering into small questions of pounds, shillings, and pence; they were glad to take what they could get; but when it came to India, then they began to consider every farthing of expenditure, and to see how much could be thrown on India and how little could be paid by the ratepayers of Great Britain. Evidently, in order to square the Army Estimates, it had been the successive practice of our Secretaries of State to endeavour to apportion to the Indian taxpayer as large a proportion as possible of these effective and non-effective charges. They were told that a Commission was about to be appointed to inquire into these matters, but his hon. friend told him in the same breath he did not think it would, on the whole, result in much advantage to the Indian people. What, then, was the good of appointing it? He hoped the result of the debate would be to awaken the War Office to the importance of this question. If they had not, before these questions of expenditure were discussed again, taken every possible opportunity of examining into them, they would be deserving of reproach.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH, as one who had for many years taken a great interest in the affairs of India, thanked the hon. member for Preston for raising this question. He did not think the House sufficiently realised how strong was the feeling in India that in the adjustment of the home charges justice had not been done to that country. It was not altogether a disadvantage, he thought, that the people of Lancashire, and through them the people of England, were beginning to feel the effects of the financial unsoundness of India. The amount we paid for pensions and retiring allowances to officers actually came to as much as the entire pay to the native army in India. One of the strongest points raised by his hon. friend was the very heavy charge for non-effective services placed upon the Indian Exchequer. The Statistical Abstract of India for last year showed that the amount charged for these services was no less than 4,700,000 tens of rupees, almost all of which, he believed, was spent in England. He did not think this included allowance for furlough. The total sum charged for civil and military pensions and furloughs was eight millions of tens of rupees, the military part, including furlough, coming to more than five millions. This was a monstrous charge, and no army in the world bore so heavy a non-effective charge. It had arisen, he believed, from the conditions consequent on the abolition of purchase. The Indian military expenditure had been growing by leaps and bounds, and in ten years it had increased, in round numbers, from eighteen million tens of rupees to twenty-four millions, and, no doubt, this enormous increase was not a little caused by the unfair apportionment of expenses between England and India. As India was an excessively poor country, the average income of the people being not more than £2 per head per annum, as against £36 per head in this country, he would rather, in case of doubt, turn the scale in favour of India than in favour of this country. He felt bound to say, after the evidence of the futility of previous inquiry, he had not very much hope from the promised inquiry. If a Committee, presided over by such a distinguished expert as Lord Northbrook, ended in nothing, what could be expected from another inquiry? It seemed hopeless, unless a totally different principle were adopted. He did not believe that any good at all would come from the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into Indian matters, unless, placed on that Commission, were Indian representatives, who would be advocates of Indian interests just as other members of the Commission would represent British interests. Two or three capable men, his hon. friend (Mr. Naoroji) and others, would deal with the subject from an Indian point of view, and then there would be some hope of the conclusions of the Commission being satisfactory. One very painful subject had been alluded to by the hon. members who moved and seconded the motion, upon which he could not be altogether silent. He took quite an opposite view as to the policy of the Indian Cantonments Acts, but no humane man could be otherwise than distressed at the outbreak of disease among our troops in India. Upon this subject we could not stand still, and certainly some great change was called for. He would only throw out a suggestion which occurred to him, and that was that we should change our whole system of recruiting for India, and go back to long service, allowing men to marry and settle in the country, giving them inducements to make homes for themselves. In old days the long-term army did admirable service, and we might go back to a system of twenty years' service, allow men to marry, keeping them as much as possible at the hill stations, and giving them handsome retiring allowances. The native troops were allowed to marry, and were mostly married men, and among them there were not those lamentable outbreaks of disease to which Europeans were exposed. Permission to marry should be given, and those who availed themselves of it would lead wholesome, natural lives. He hoped the result of the debate would lead to the constitution of a Committee or Commission, on lines that would secure an honest handling of delicate Indian questions. If the Home Department brought down on the heads of the Commission endless accounts and a confusing mass of figures, the result would be nugatory, and the inquiry had better not be entered upon. Let another plan be adopted—let a small Commission equally represent England and India, and he hoped some good would result.

Sir A. D. HAYTER said the idea was conveyed by several speakers in support of the Amendment that India was called upon to pay for soldiers serving in this country. That was liable to great misapprehension. The arrangement made between the India Office and the War Department was that the expenses of the first six months' training of infantry soldiers and the first nine months' training of artillery and cavalry soldiers in this country were charged to India. That was always considered a fair charge, because those recruits were not doing regular and effective duty in this country, but were being trained for regular and effective duty in India. India paid a proportion of the expense of training artillery officers at Shoeburyness and engineer officers at Chatham. She paid part of the expenses of Netley Hospital and of the discharge depôt at Gosport. She repaid the money advanced as pay by England to soldiers on passage to India. But the principal part was for soldiers training in England for Indian duty. However, he congratulated his hon. friend the member for Preston on the fact that he had induced the authorities of the War Office to appoint a Committee to go into the matter. But he warned his hon. friend that it was extremely probable that the result of the Committee's investigation would be against him unless the principle on which the contribution was made by India was altered. He had taken the opportunity of consulting one of the best authorities on this point, namely, the Accountant-General of the Army, who was examined upon it by the Committee on Public Accounts in March, 1893. The following was part of the examination: "Is the War Office satisfied with this capitation rate as adequate to cover the expenses they are put to?—We have accepted something about that sum now for some years past; but, speaking my personal opinion, I do not think it represents the expense to us of the Indian depôts.—You think the arrangement leaves the Army Vote a loser?—I do, certainly." Later on the examination was continued by the Secretary to the Treasury (Sir J. Hibbert): "The Treasury apparently is not satisfied with the existing arrangement by which the amount is settled from year to year?—The Treasury is disposed, I think, to agree with the War Department, the £7 10s. apart from deferred pay does not quite cover the cost." By arrangement with the Treasury, the sum had been accepted up to March, 1894; and he did not know what had been done in the year that had since elapsed. But if there was any belief in the minds of the natives of India that too much was charged to India, then the whole basis of the charge ought to be gone into, item by item, until a Committee was satisfied what the proper charge would be.

Major **Rasch** said no one could fail to understand why these charges were regarded with serious dissatisfaction. He had always understood that the reason why these charges were made was that the British army was considered to be to a certain extent kept up for the sake of the Indian Empire; that it was considered as a reserve of the Indian army, and that in these circumstances the natives of India had no ground of complaint. But a few facts would disprove that hypothesis. The military history of the last ninety years would show that, so far from the English army being a reserve for the Anglo-Indian forces, the reverse was practically the truth. In the campaigns in the Sutlej and the Punjab, and in the Mutiny, the English army was held as a reserve for the Indian army; but the Indian army was a reserve for the British army in pretty nearly every war of this century, as in Sir James Beard's Expedition in Egypt in 1801, in the Java Expedition in 1810, in Persia in 1842, in China in 1860, in Abyssinia in 1867, and in the Soudan in 1882. This list successfully disposed of the theory on which these estimates were framed, that the English army was kept up as a reserve for the Indian forces. He should like to add how glad he was that the whole charge for the Opium Commission had been placed upon England, and he should have been better pleased if the cost could have been thrown upon the faddists and philosophers who induced the Government to appoint the Commission.

Mr. D. **Naoroji** wished to offer his most hearty thanks to the mover and seconder of the Motion, and to all who had spoken. The Secretary for War ought to be glad that he had had the opportunity of explaining what he thought the majority of the House did not know. This debate had given him very great gratification; it would do a great deal of good, not only in India, but in England itself; and it made him glad that Lancashire was waking up. He had been disposed at times, by the proceedings of the House, to give way to feelings of despair; but this debate had given him new hope, that this House would be true to its better instincts, to its love of fair play, and would do justice to India. In the account with India, England must remember the immense gain and glory she derived from India. After all, it was a question of large policy; it was whether the natives of India were to be treated as helpless subjects, or whether they were to be regarded as part and parcel of the British Empire, with the rights of British citizenship.

The House divided, and the numbers were:

For the Motion	25
Against	88
	—
Majority against the motion ..	63

March 19*th*.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EXCISE DUTIES ON SPIRITS.

Mr. **Snape** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, in many of the provinces of India, the Excise Duty on proof spirits was below the Customs Duty on imported spirits, and below the Home Excise Duty:

Whether the Excise and Customs Duty could be equalised, so as in no case to be below the maximum duty now levied, either in India or in this country:

And, whether, if this were done, it would be possible to supply the deficit in the revenue by this means, and so relieve the Indian Budget.

Mr. **George Russell** (for Mr. Fowler): The facts are as stated in the first clause of my hon. friend's question. The Excise duties have of late years been enhanced, and the process of enhancement is still going on; but a sudden and large increase of this form of taxation is not considered expedient.

INDIA AND THE NAVY.

In the discussion in Committee of Supply, on the Vote of £49,519 to make good the excess of expenditure for Navy services in 1893-94,

Mr. **Forwood** called attention to the fact that it was stated in the Parliamentary Paper explanatory of the Vote that "the deficit on appropriations-in-aid was the portion of the contribution from the Indian Government on account of ships in Indian waters which could not be met by savings, and that the total non-payment by India amounted to £67,000." The hon. member suggested that the state of the account illustrated the practice too often adopted of making estimates look pleasant at the beginning of the year by taking credit for more than was likely to be received.

Mr. E. **Robertson** admitted that too large a credit was taken in the Estimates for the Indian contribution. There were, however, questions of difference between the Home Government and the Indian Government as to what naval services should be paid for, and it was left to Lord Rosebery to decide what interpretation was to be put on the terms of the arrangements originally come to.

Mr. **Hanbury** feared that the reference to Lord Rosebery was of too limited a scope, and would go to no distance in settling the real question which many of them wished to see settled, viz., what was the proper payment which India should make for the services of certain vessels in Indian waters.

Mr. **Robertson** said that it was agreed some time ago between India and the Admiralty that India should pay for the vessels employed for Indian purposes. But the contention of the Indian Government was now was that certain small vessels only were to be paid for by India—vessels which were used for what might be called police purposes. The contention of the Admiralty was that vessels were to be paid for which were required for the protection of Indian trade. It was left to Lord Rosebery to interpret which view was contemplated when the agreement was come to in the first instance.

The matter then ended.

THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

On the Vote for £16,900, the expenses of the Opium Commission,

Sir **Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett**: I should say there is not one single member of the House who has not been compelled to take an interest in this opium question; and I suppose it would be impossible to find in the whole history of agitations a more complete illustration of unfairness and blindness than has been shown by that political abomination, the society of crotcheteers, which advocated the Opium Commission. (Hear, hear.) I hope the lesson of that Commission will not be lost upon those who are still running after fads and crotchets and prejudices quite as absurd as that. For a long time it was contended that the charge for that Commission should be divided between this country and India, and I am glad indeed to know that that monstrous proposal had at last to be abandoned, and that this country has to pay the whole charge. (Hear, hear.) The people of India did not wish for that Commission. It was not to their interest that the Commission went out; it was only the crotcheteers and faddists who thought that it was to their interests, and the result of the Commission has been to prove that the use of opium in India, so far from being the cause of injury to the people of India, in a great majority of cases benefitted them. (Hear, hear.) That is undoubtedly the result of the working of the Commission. But, Sir, though the people of India are freed of that charge, the taxpayers of the United Kingdom have to pay, I do not know exactly how much, but it must be at least £20,000.

Mr. HIBBERT: £16,900.

Sir E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Well, the taxpayers of England are called upon to pay about £20,000 to satisfy the prejudices and crotchets of one of the most absurd agitations that has ever been started in this or any other country. (Hear, hear.) I never heard of any Conservative taking part in that agitation. There may be such a character, but if there is he is a very rare bird indeed. No; the gentlemen who promoted that Bill, and worried our lives with petitions and circulars during the last four years, and who imposed this Commission upon India and the taxpayers of this country, are the gentlemen who sit on the other side, who were assisted by their friends in the country; and I hope they will remember what has been the outcome of this Commission, what it has cost the country, and especially the mischief it might have wrought. I hope they have also been led to consider that, upon other questions connected with India, equally important, most dangerous crotchets and fads are raging, and what will be the result of trying to impress these fads upon the Government and upon this House. (Cheers.)

Mr. B. L. COHEN: Happily one result of the Commission has been to dispel a lot of those ideas which existed among many earnest and sincere but ill-informed faddists in this country. I am not sure that the outcry which we have had this evening about the various Royal Commissions has been well-founded, for I think that they discharge a very expensive but useful function when they dispel illusions. (Hear, hear.) They are at any rate useful instruments of Government to both sides of the House. I don't care which side is in power, for they get rid of very embarassing questions, such as bimetallism, which although some have authorities for their theories in connection with that question, is to my mind another delusion. If the delusions of those who think it would be a cure for the silver question could be expelled by a little reasonable expenditure on a Royal Commission, no money could be better spent, and no Government would not be justified in instituting a well-grounded investigation. (Hear, hear.) I am quite certain that the Government will do its utmost to get rid of these people by indulging in a course which would not be unfriendly to India, and I am not one of those who will share in any attack upon them for having resorted to these useful and necessary Commissions. (Hear, hear.)

Sir M. J. STEWART: My friends have been indulging in rather strong language with regard to this Commission on the opium traffic between India and China. Of course there are two features of this question; but I would remind the House that there was a great concensus of opinion outside, which was convinced that we were doing a great wrong to India by permitting the growth and sale of opium there. How were we to get rid of that? Naturally we had all kinds of motions. There was one in 1877, and others down to the very day on which this Commission was appointed. Of course, we had the answers of the officials, but still many considered that the evil was a terrible one. On the other hand, there has been evidence to show that it was not a harmful thing, and that it did no great harm, and even that in malarial districts it was found to be a great protection against fever and malaria and other forms of Eastern disease. I am bound to say that I was one of those who suggested the idea of this Commission, and the idea was backed up by large numbers of interests, and the Government was dependent upon those who were interested in seeing legislation on this important question. Of course, those notions have been dispelled on being investigated, but I would remind the House that we have not yet seen the report of the Commission. We don't know what it is, and therefore it is easy to jump up and talk bitterly on this question, not knowing what the report is to be. What has this Commission done? It had a certain phase of judgment. It has investigated this judgment. It had a very impartial chairman, and, so far as I know, it was a very able and impartial Commission. They have taken in an immense amount of papers, and have investigated matters in different parts of India. They have heard both sides—British-Indian officials and others, and the question is, Was the Commission worth having or not? If it was worth having, it was worth £15,000; and if not, my hon. friend would have been perfectly right to move for a reduction of the Vote. But he has not done so, and therefore I conclude that he thinks on the whole that it is justified. If so, I am at one with him, and he is at one with me. There are many Radicals who took a certain side, but on the other hand there were many men who had given their best brains and attention to this question, and said they would like to see it threshed out. They have seen it threshed out, and when we get the report we shall know much better what to do and how to answer the different arguments thrown in the teeth of the Government of India by themselves. I am certain that the time spent over this Commission has not been misspent, and that the evidence accumulated has not been accumulated in vain, but that we shall be able to start again on a sounder basis than we have ever been on before on this question. We do not ask them to believe any clap-trap stories. We shall read the report, and if we do not agree I shall still contend that this Commission has been on the right basis, and that it will prove that it will be the best thing that the country could have done, for it will at all events either settle the question or effect a new departure upon it, and enable the House of Commons to legislate on that new departure. (Cheers.)

Mr. G. T. C. BARTLEY: I may remind the House that during the last Session I asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the whole charge would come into this country, and that I received the usual answer. He said he could not think of it, and that India must bear its fair share of the charge. (Laughter.) It is satisfactory to find that the Government has listened to the voice of wisdom during the recess, and has abandoned the idea of putting part of this large sum on India. I ask the House to consider what the feeling would be in England if the Muhammadans sent a Commission into England to inquire into the use of alcohol, a thing which they did not use, and if we were asked to pay half the cost, the House would laugh at the idea, but the cases are exactly on all fours. (Hear, hear.) I am extremely glad that the Government is going to do right and allow England to pay the whole cost of the Commission. We could not congratulate them on doing right had it not been that on this occasion the recess has made them think over the matter and pressure has been brought to bear upon them by some of their friends and followers, who, during the discussion on the subject last year in this House, took the same view as I did and thought that we had no right to charge India for the collection of information which was not wanted by that country but by England. (Hear, hear.) I am, therefore, extremely glad that we have got to pay the whole cost of the Commission, although I must candidly say that between £16,000 and £17,000 does seem a very large cost. I have never been to India, and, therefore, cannot tell what the cost of travelling about that country is, but this amount seems a large item for a few gentlemen to expend in going to inquire into the condition of the opium trade. They do things in Oriental style in India, but certainly I think we might have got the informatian at very much less cost. However, as this scandal is removed and India has not to pay anything towards the cost of the Commission, we must make the best of it, pay the bill, and hope that the next Commission will be cheaper. (Hear, hear.)

Sir JOHN HIBBERT: I just wish to say that the reference which the hon. member (Mr. Bartley) made to the discussion on the subject last year, shows how wise he was, and he is entitled to take some credit to himself in the matter. A large part of the expenditure has been paid to Indian officials, who have received salaries, and only about £6,000 or £7,000 has been spent in travelling and other expenses by the Commissioners. I desire to say now that, whether we agree that the Commission has done good or harm, whether we believe that it will be of advantage or otherwise, or that it was necessary or unnecessary, I think we are all agreed that the thanks of this House are due to the Chairman and members of the Commission for the way in which they have laboured since their appointment. (Hear, hear.) I wish on behalf of the Government, therefore, to tender to the Chairman and his colleagues, our thanks for the way in which they devoted themselves to the services they had to discharge. (Cheers.)

Mr. W. S. CAINE: I did not wish to take any part in the discussion of this question, but my hon. friend, the member for the Ecceshall division of Sheffield (Sir Ashmead Bartlett), has communicated to the House his opinion that this Commission was granted to the demands of a certain class in this House whom he was pleased to call faddists—(hear, hear)—and among whom I suppose he included myself. I do not at all object to that expression, but I want to point out to the hon. member that if he had taken the trouble to look up the debate on the appointment of the Commission, he would have seen that we voted against its appointment. I spoke and voted against it, and if the hon. gentleman would look at the division list, he would, I think, see that of the 105 members who voted against the Commission, 97 were supporters of Her Majesty's Government, and only the remaining few were on his side of the House. I think before the hon. member gets up and makes statements against members of this House, he should satisfy himself as to what the facts are.

Colonel **Lockwood**: I have only one question to ask, and that is about the Report of the Commission. I believe the Committee returned from India about June or July of last year, and we are now getting towards the end of March, and no report has been presented. I am among those who hold that the Commission was necessary even at the great cost that it has been to the country, and I should now like to ask when we may expect to receive its Report.

Sir J. **Hibbert**: The reason why the Report has not yet been presented to the House is because it has had to be sent out to India to be signed by some native members of the Commission. As soon as it is returned from India it will be sent to the Home Office for presentation to the House.

Mr. **Tomlinson**: I quite agree with my hon. friend in congratulating the Government upon their repentance which has resulted in the throwing of the whole cost of the Opium Commission on this country. At the same time, I desire to observe that this tardy repentance does not counteract the great injury which has been done by the first decision of the Government to throw half the cost upon India. This matter, combined with the question of the import duties on Lancashire goods, has created a degree of excitement and disturbance in India, and an apprehension exists there that India is being worked in the interests of this country rather than in her own interests. This uncomfortable state of feeling arose, as I say, partly from the fact that in the first instance the Government of this country intended to throw upon India half of the cost of a commission which they did not desire and did not want. Although the Government have done, no doubt, all they can to remedy the mischief which has been occasioned by that proceeding, still we in this country cannot be in the same position as we should have been if they had in the first instance looked upon this as a commission made entirely in the interests of this country, and not in the interests of India at all.

Sir **Ashmead-Bartlett**: I wish to correct a misapprehension which seems to exist in the mind of the hon. member for East Bradford (Mr. Caine). He appears to think that my expression "faddists and crotcheteers" was directed only against members of this House. It applied to the Indian opium agitators in general, and no matter what part the hon. member may have taken in any particular division in this House I imagine that among those agitators he holds the position of arch-priest

Sir Richard Temple: May I ask whether it is quite clear that the whole cost of this Commission is to be borne by this country. We ought to have absolute satisfaction on this subject, because there is no doubt that public opinion in India is very much exercised regarding the matter. This Commission was put upon the people of India very much against their desire, and was upon a subject in which they deemed no inquiry was necessary, and regarding which all necessary information was at the disposal of the British Government. (Hear, hear.) At all events, we may be allowed to ask when the report of the Commission will be presented. It is high time——

An **Hon. Member**: That question has just been replied to.

Sir **Richard Temple**: I understand from my hon. friend that that question has been answered. Well, I am sure we shall look forward to the report with very much interest, because the popular idea is—among Anglo-Indians at least—that this report will largely justify the existing system with regard to the opium revenue in India. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member then proceeded to discuss the Commission upon secondary education, and moved the reduction of the Vote.

Mr. R. G. **Webster** rose to continue the debate on the Opium Commission, but

The **Chairman** (Mr. J. W. Lowther) ruled him out of order, deciding that a motion for reduction having been moved on a particular ground the discussion must be confined to that point.

March 21st.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE EXPEDITION AGAINST UMRA KHAN.

Viscount **Cross** said that, seeing the Under Secretary of State for India in his place, he wished to ask him whether he could give the House any further information about the movements in Chitral.

Lord **Reay**: Chitral is a State under British protection, being tributary to Kashmir, and is the residence of a British agent. In consequence of recent troubles in Chitral, and in response to a request for recognition from the *de facto* ruler, Dr. Robertson, the political officer at Gilghit was sent in January to Chitral to inquire and report. Since then Umra Khan, the ruler of some neighbouring Pathan States, has invaded Chitral with a large force, and is believed to be now investing Dr. Robertson and his escort in the Chitral fort. Considering the urgent necessity for relieving Dr. Robertson without delay, the Government of India have summoned Umra Khan to evacuate Chitral by the 1st of April, and in view of the possibility of his refusal are preparing a force to march from Peshawur on that date. The Government of India state that they consider no other method of relief to be possible; they have duly notified to the Secretary of State the measures which they propose to take, and they have been informed by him that the steps which they deem necessary for the relief of Dr. Robertson and his party have his full approval.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY BILL.

The East India Railway Bill was considered, and ordered for third reading.

THE EXPEDITION AGAINST UMRA KHAN.

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India whether a force of 14,000 men had been organised to proceed against Umra Khan, some 200 miles beyond the Indian frontier; and, if so, whether the expedition was being sent under instructions from the Secretary of State:

Whether he would inform the House what action on the part of Umra Khan had rendered this expedition necessary:

And, whether the expenses of this military operation were being defrayed from the revenues of India; and, if so, whether this was being done in accordance with the provisions of s. 55 of 21 and 22 Vic., c. 106.

Mr. **George Russell** (for Mr. Fowler): The facts are approximately as stated in the first clause of the honourable member's question, but the distance is less than 200 miles. Chitral is a State under British protection, being tributary to Kashmir; and is the residence of a British agent. In consequence of recent troubles in Chitral, and in response to a request for recognition from the *de facto* ruler, Dr. Robertson, the political officer at Gilghit was sent in January to Chitral to inquire and report. Since then Umra Khan, the ruler of some neighbouring Pathan States, has invaded Chitral with a large force, and is believed to be now investing Dr. Robertson and his escort in the Chitral fort. Considering the urgent necessity for relieving Dr. Robertson without delay, the Government of India have summoned Umra Khan to evacuate Chitral by the 1st of April; and in view of the possibility of his refusal are preparing to march from Peshawur on that date. The Government of India state that they consider no other method of relief to be possible; they have duly notified to the Secretary of State the measures which they propose to take, and they have been informed by him that the steps which they deem necessary for the relief of Dr. Robertson and his party have his full approval.

The expense of these preparations is being defrayed by the Government of India, and the Secretary of State is advised that nothing has been done in contravention of section 55 of the Act for the better Government of India.

VICTORIA TECHNICAL INSTITUTE, MADRAS.

Mr. **Caine** asked the Secretary of State for India if he was aware that the Victoria Technical Institute, Pantheon Street, Madras, founded 22nd March, 1890, to commemorate the Jubilee of the Queen-Empress, was now completed at a cost of

£14,000, and that the purposes for which the building was iintended, as set forth by an inscription on the foundation stone, were those of a Free Library and Victoria Technical Institute, the latter being an already established public body:

And whether the Government had refused to apply any portion of the buildings to technical instruction, but had handed it over instead to the Madras Dramatic Society, an amateur theatrical society of which the Governor is the patron; if so, would he order that the building should be devoted to the purpose for which it was originally intended.

Mr. **GEORGE RUSSELL** (for Mr. Fowler): The Secretary of State has no knowledge of the circumstances to which my hon. friend's question refers, but he will make inquiry.

THE MARRIAGE-SYSTEM IN MALABAR.

Mr. **CAINE** asked the Secretary of State for India, with reference to the Commission which was appointed in 1889 by the Government of India to inquire into the marriage system prevailing in Malabar, and as that Commission reported in December, 1891, had final orders yet been passed upon it by the Secretary of State.

Mr. **GEORGE RUSSELL** (for Mr. Fowler): The Commissioners were divided in opinion, but the Indian authorities preferred the views expressed by the President, the late Sir T. Muthesamy Aiyar, and the Bill is under revision accordingly. The Secretary of State has not yet seen the revised Bill, nor has he passed any orders on the subject.

THE HEMP DRUGS COMMISSION.

Mr. **CAINE** asked the Secretary of State for India, if he had yet received the Report of the Hemp Drugs Commission:

And, when the Report of the Opium Commission was likely to be issued.

Mr. **GEORGE RUSSELL** (for Mr. Fowler): (1) The Secretary of State has received copies of the Ganja Commission Report, but not of the orders passed by the Government of India thereon:

(2) As was stated by the Secretary of State on the 11th of last month, it is anticipated that the Report of the Opium Commission will be ready by Easter.

THE CASE OF CAPTAIN HOLMES.

Mr. **CAINE** asked the Secretary of State for India if he was aware that serious charges had been made in the public press of Madras against Captain Holmes, one of the Aides-de-Camp to the Governor of Madras, to the effect that he had acted unfairly in the matter of a horse race; that, in consequence, an inquiry was made by the stewards of the Western India Turf Club, who had published their decision, stating that the jockey who acted with Captain Holmes was unfit to hold a trainer's licence, which was accordingly revoked, and that Captain Holmes himself had shown an undoubted desire to conceal the fact of the trial of his horse with another both before and after the race, and that it was his duty to have ascertained beyond all possible doubt that the owner of the other horse was made aware of it, a duty which he neglected to perform;

And was Captain Holmes still Aide-de-Camp to the Governor.

Mr. **GEORGE RUSSELL** (for Mr. Fowler): The Secretary of State has no information on the subject, but has no doubt that, if the facts are as stated, they will be inquired into by the authorities in India, and the necessary action taken.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI. Supplement No. 3. MAY, 1895.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from March 25th to April 25th.

Imperial Parliament.

March 25th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

Lord **Knutsford**: I desire to ask whether the Government can give the House any further information about Chitral.

Lord **Reay**: Beyond the information given to the House on the 21st instant, in reply to Lord Cross's question, and a report identical with that which appeared in the newspapers about the melancholy loss of Captain Ross and his party near Boni, the Secretary of State has no information.

It is believed that the British Agent with 300 men is still invested in the Chitral Fort, and the Government of India have reported that the Chitral relief force will be despatched as soon as it can be made ready—by April 1, if possible. So far as the Secretary of State is aware, the Government of India have not recognised anyone as the new Mehtar of Chitral.

It is not known for certain where Umra Khan is, but he is supposed to be still in Chitral territory. Some of his men are reported by Lieutenant Jones to be holding the Fort of Drasan, to the north of Chitral. No information has been received from Dr. Robertson direct of later date than March 1st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EAST INDIAN RAILWAY BILL.

The East Indian Railway Bill was read a third time.

THE INDIAN TROOPSHIPS.

Mr. **William Allan** asked the Civil Lord of the Admiralty how many troopships had been sold during the last two years:

And whether it was the intention of the Admiralty to dispose of the rest of those vessels.

Mr. **Robertson**: Three of the Indian troopships have been sold by the Indian Government. One of the Indian troopships was bought by the Admiralty, and may be shortly utilised as a powder hulk. None of the Imperial troopships have been sold; two ("Tyne" and "Wye") are still running. The "Himalaya" will be fitted as a coal hulk. The "Tamar" is shortly proceeding to Hong-Kong to be fitted as a receiving hulk. The "Assistance" may be shortly required as a powder hulk. The "Malabar," Indian troopship, is still running.

FLOGGING IN THE INDIAN ARMY.

Mr. **Hanbury** asked the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the second reading of the Army (Annual) Bill having been put upon the paper for that day, he could state whether it was proposed in it to maintain the punishment of flogging in the case of Indian native troops, although it had been abolished in the case of all troops in the British army, including the black troops of the West India regiments:

And whether the intervention of the Secretary of State for India, as promised in Committee on this Bill last year, had led to any alteration of the law in that respect.

Mr. **George Russell**: The Secretary of State for India has been, and is still, in communication with the Government of India on this subject; but no change can take place till a Bill has been passed through the Legislative Council of India.

Mr. **Hanbury**: May I ask the hon. gentleman whether he is able to give the House any information as to whether the Government of India have arrived at any decision during the past year? The Under Secretary promised a year ago that he would communicate with the Government.

Mr. **George Russell**: I have answered the question in the terms put into my hands. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will put the question down.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

Mr. **Curzon**: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India a question of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether he can give the House any further information upon the state of affairs in Chitral: whether the British Agent is still invested in the Chitral fort, and, if so, what steps are being taken for his support or relief; whether the Indian Government have recognised a Mehtar of Chitral; and whether any further information is forthcoming as to the attitude of Umra Khan.

Mr. **George Russell**: Beyond the information given to the House on 21st instant in reply to Sir William Wedderburn's question, and a report identical with that which appeared in the newspapers about the melancholy loss of Captain Ross and his party near Boni, the Secretary of State has no information.

It is believed that the British Agent with 300 men is still invested in the Chitral fort, and the Government of India have reported that the Chitral relief force will be despatched as soon as it can be made ready, by the 1st April if possible.

It is not known where Umra Khan is for certain, but he is supposed to be still in Chitral territory. Some of his men are reported by Lieutenant Jones to be holding the fort of Drasan to the north of Chitral. No information has been received from Dr. Robertson direct of later date than 1st March.

So far as the Secretary of State is aware the Government of India have not recognised anyone as the new Mehtar of Chitral.

INDIA AND THE FINANCE ACT, 1894.

Mr. **James Lowther** asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether section 20 of the Finance Act, 1894, already applied to British India and the feudatory native states to which British political officers were appointed: and, if not, whether steps would be taken with a view to the issue of the necessary order in Council.

The **Chancellor of the Exchequer**: Section 20 of th Finance Act, 1894, has been applied to British India by order in Council dated February 2nd, 1895. The order in Council does not extend the section to any part of India where the law of British India does not apply, and therefore it does not extend it to any feudatory native states.

March 26th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE MAHARAJA OF BHARTPUR.

Mr. **Seymour Keay** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been called to a telegram published in the *Times* of the 18th instant, stating that as the Mahárájá of Bhartpur had shown himself incapable of governing his State, the British Resident would administer it until other arrangements were made:

Whether the present Mahárájá only ascended the throne on the death of his father about 12 months ago, and whether on that occasion the Government of India notified that the British Resident would conduct the Government for a period of 12 months:

What opportunity had the Mahárájá had of proving his capacity or otherwise for conducting his own Government:

And, could he state what he had done to merit so serious a punishment as appeared to have been inflicted.

Mr. **George Russell**: No information has been received beyond what has appeared in the newspapers. The Government of India have been asked to furnish a report by mail as soon as possible.

INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

Mr. **Holland** asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was the intention of the Indian Government to give effect to the House of Commons' resolution of July, 1877, relating to import duties, viz., that they ought to be repealed without delay, so soon as the financial condition of India will permit.

Mr. **George Russell**: The Indian Government, no doubt, regret the necessity for imposing a duty upon imports; but the state of the finances of India is not at present such as to encourage any hope that it can be dispensed with.

March 28th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

AVERAGE ANNUAL INCOME IN INDIA. LORD CROMER'S STATEMENT WITHHELD.

Mr. **Naoroji** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, to ascertain the correctness of Lord Cromer's statement of 1882 about the annual average income per head, and to show whether the people of British India were improving or becoming worse in their material condition, he would grant the return for which a motion stood on this day's paper:

And whether, if he were unwilling to grant as a return the details of Lord Cromer's calculations, as asked in the first part of the motion, he would give an opportunity to the hon. member for Finsbury of personally inspecting them.

Sir E. **Grey**: Considering that the statement to which my hon. friend refers was confessedly founded upon uncertain data, and that any similar calculation which might now be made must be founded on equally uncertain data and might probably be misleading, the Secretary of State is unable to agree to my hon. friend's motion.

THE POLICY OF TRANS-FRONTIER AGGRESSION. IS THE EXPENDITURE LEGAL?

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the consent of both Houses of Parliament, under section 55 of 21 and 22 Vic. c. 106 (An Act for the better Government of India), was obtained for the expenditure on military operations beyond the West and North-West Frontiers of India of the following sums (shown in a Parliamentary Return entitled "East India Military Expenditure beyond the Frontier)," and dated India Office, February, 1895, viz.: Rx. 159,116 in 1884-5; Rx. 2,121,086 in 1885-6; Rx. 116,055 in 1888-9; Rx. 4,825 in 1889-90; Rx. 143,730 in 1890-91:

And, upon what date, with reference to each of the sums mentioned in the previous question was the consent of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords respectively obtained for such expenditure.

Sir E. **Grey**: The figures given in the Return under the head "Expeditions and Explorations: Expenditure in the Military Department" do not relate to what are called in clause 55 of the Act for the better Government of India, "Military operations carried on beyond the external frontiers" of Her Majesty's Indian possessions for which, as the hon. baronet points out, the consent of Parliament is necessary:—and as a matter of fact there were during the period covered by the Return no "Military operations beyond the external frontiers" on the North-West which were held to fall within the scope of section 55 of the Act.

A reference to the Return which comprises such items as "Railways," "Fortifications," and "Cantonments," shows that it does not refer to expenditure beyond the frontiers of India in the strict sense of the words.

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been drawn to an article by the right hon. Sir R. Garth, late Chief Justice of Bengal, in the last number of the *Law Magazine and Review*, as to the value of the Indian National Congress:

And, whether he would state what arrangements the Government of India made to give a hearing to the annual representations of that body.

Sir E. **Grey**: The Secretary of State has not seen the article to which the hon. member refers, and is, therefore, unable to give any opinion upon its contents.

March 29th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

LEAVE RULES OF THE CIVIL DEPARTMENTS.

Sir **Richard Temple** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Government of India had submitted proposals tending to ameliorate the conditions of service furlough, etc., of European officials of the Indian police and other branches of the Civil (Uncovenanted) Service of India; and, if so, whether any decision had been come to thereon; and, if not, whether a speedy one might be expected.

Mr. **Herbert Gladstone**: The Government of India have submitted proposals respecting the leave rules of the various Civil Departments in India. These are now under the consideration of the Secretary of State; but before a final decision can be passed on all points, a further reference to the Government of India will probably be necessary.

FLOGGING IN THE INDIAN ARMY.

On the order for the third reading of the Army (Annual) Bill,

Mr. **Hanbury** called attention to the distinction drawn between the natives of India and the white men, serving in the Indian Army, in regard to the punishment of flogging, to which the former were liable. These punishments were not only applicable to the natives of India when serving in India, but also even when they came to this country, or served side by side with British troops in Egypt or elsewhere. He was anxious to do away once and for ever with this most invidious distinction. For the law which thus exempted the white man from the punishment of flogging, while it reserved it for the natives, the Government of India were not responsible; it was the deliberate act of the House in passing this Act which they were not allowed to amend.

April 1st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EXCISE REVENUE IN THE PUNJAB.

Mr. **Samuel Smith** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been drawn to the large increase in the amount of excise revenue in the Punjab during the last seven years, amounting to nearly 50 per cent. on the revenue of 1888:

And, whether the Indian Government was taking any steps to prevent the corresponding amount of drunkenness which might be expected to follow this increased consumption of alcohol.

Mr. **George Russell**: It is true that the excise revenue in the Punjab has largely increased. The Government of India, by enhancing taxation and by repressing illicit distillation, is doing what it can to discourage excessive consumption, and this policy will be pursued in the future as circumstances may permit.

OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL LIST.

Mr. **Kimber** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been drawn to the case of the 51 officers who entered the Indian Army in the transition period 1859-61, called Officers of the General List, who entered the Local Service under the option given them by a Government Order in 1861, and who by official declaration down to 1865 were placed on the same footing as the other officers in the Local Service, who had nevertheless been deprived of the privilege of entering the Staff Corps from the Local Service, although other Local Service Officers retained that privilege, were not allowed to take their Majorities and Colonelcies until they had had 20 and 26 years' service respectively, and in 1882, by fresh pension rules, were differentiated from other Local Service Officers, deprived of the right of Colonel's allowances after 12 years' service as Lieutenant Colonel (which right was assured to them by the Royal Warrant of June, 1864), and granted inferior pensions to those of their brother officers in the Local Service:

Whether any explanation had been given for the distinction drawn between the two bodies of officers who had elected for Local Service, although other officers who went at the same time from the General List to the other two branches of service, viz., Staff Corps and General Service, had been treated exactly on the same terms as their brother officers in those respective Services:

Whether this question had been repeatedly brought before the Secretary of State:

What was the present position of the question:

And, was it probable that any satisfaction would be given at an early date to the grievances of these 51 officers.

Mr. **George Russell**: The case of the officers of the General List has been considered by successive Secretaries of State, who have never admitted that these officers, who were appointed after the Government of India had been taken over by the Crown, had the same rights as officers of the Local Service appointed prior to that date.

The question was discussed in the House of Commons on the 8th June, 1888, and since then has been considered by Lord Kimberley and by the present Secretary of State who saw no ground for disturbing the previous decisions.

Mr. Fowler is not prepared to re-open the case.

April 2nd.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

Viscount **Cross**: I should like to ask whether any further information has been received by the Government from Chitral.

Lord **Reay**: The only information that has reached us is that Colonel Kelly has reached Gupis.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE COST OF TRANS-FRONTIER AGGRESSION. IS THE EXPENDITURE LEGAL? NO OFFICIAL MAPS!

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India what official maps of India show for each of the years 1858-9, 1874-5, 1884-5) and 1894-5, the external frontiers of Her Majesty's Indian possessions, for the purposes of section 55 of 21 and 22 Vic., c. 106, the Act for the better Government of India.

Mr. **George Russell**: No official maps are in existence to show the external frontiers of Her Majesty's Indian dominions, with reference to section 55 of the Act for the better government of India.

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India how much of the following sums, namely, Rx. 159,116, Rx. 2,121,086, Rx. 116,055, Rx. 4,825, and Rx. 143,730, shown under the heading of "Expeditions and Explorations, Expenditure in the Military Department," in a Parliamentary Return entitled "East India (Military Expenditure beyond the Frontiers)," and dated India Office, February, 1895, related to military expeditions beyond the West and North-West frontiers of India:

And whether expenditure on military expeditions beyond the West and North-West frontiers of India was included within the words of clause 55 of the Act for the better government of India, namely, "expenses of any military operation carried on beyond the external frontiers of Her Majesty's Indian possessions;" and, if not, upon what grounds.

Mr. **George Russell**: A Return of the 8th June, 1894, No. 20, "East India (Military Expenditure)," shows the occasions on which the expenditure referred to was incurred, and its amount under each head.

It will be seen from that Return that in 1884-5 the bulk of the expenditure was incurred at Quetta in connection with the demarcation of the Russo-Afghan frontier; and that in the three years 1888-89 to 1890 there was expenditure on the Black Mountain expeditions, and also in the last of those years on an expedition against the tribes on the Miranzai border.

As to the second paragraph of the question, the Secretary of State has nothing to add to the explanation given on the 28th March in answer to a similar question of the hon. baronet's.

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the military operations in Afghanistan, involving during the years 1879-9 to 1882-3 an expenditure of Rx. 18,190,132, as shown in a recent Parliamentary Return, were military operations carried on beyond the external frontiers of Her Majesty's Indian possessions, within the meaning of section 55 of 21 and 22 Vic., c. 106, an Act for the better government of India:

Whether the consent of Parliament was obtained for the expenditure on these military operations of the following sums: Rx. 600,270 in 1878-9, Rx. 4,642,143 in 1879-80, Rx. 11,297,926 in 1880-1, Rx. 1,631,924 in 1881-2, and Rx. 17,869 in 1882-3 (shown in the Parliamentary Return above referred to):

And upon what date, with reference to each of the sums mentioned in the previous question, was the consent of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords, respectively, obtained for such expenditure.

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India whether and upon what date was the consent of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords respectively obtained for the application of the revenues of India to defray the expenses of military operations in Egypt, being Rx. 1,176,142 in 1882-3, and Rx. 47,874 in 1883-4, as required by clause 55 of the Act for the better government of India:

And whether and upon what date was the consent of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords respectively obtained for the application of the revenues of India to defray the expenses of the annexation of Upper Burma, the military operations connected therewith involving the following expenditure: Rx. 631,000 in 1885-6, Rx. 1,517,800 in 1886-7, and Rx. 1,475,300 in 1887-8.

Mr. **George Russell**: The following are the dates of the Resolutions in both Houses of Parliament, under which, in accordance with sec. 55 of the Act for the better government of India, the expenditure mentioned in the hon. baronet's questions was incurred:—Military operations: Afghanistan, Lords, 10th December, 1878; Commons, 17th December, 1878. Egypt, Lords, 25th July, 1882; Commons, 31st July, 1882. Burma, Lords and Commons, 22nd February, 1886.

MILITARY OFFICERS ON LEAVE.

Mr. **Pierpoint** asked the Secretary of State for War whether officers of a regiment serving in India who are at home on leave, in case the regiment is detailed for service in the field, though expected to rejoin without delay, have besides sacrificing their leave to pay their own passages out unless they are recalled by an order of the Adjutant-General in India.

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman: The facts are as stated in the question; but even if recalled by the authorities in India it would be a question for the India Office whether the circumstances would justify an officer's passage being granted at the expense of the Indian Government. It is a well-understood rule that if an officer, whose regiment is abroad, comes home for his own convenience he must rejoin his regiment at his own expense whenever required to do so.

Mr. Pierpoint asked whether the Indian Government ever had, in the circumstances stated by the right hon. gentleman, allowed the expenses of an officer's passage out to India.

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman: I am not aware that they have the power to do it.

April 4th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

In answer to the Marquess of Lansdowne,

Lord Reay said: I can communicate a telegram just received from the Viceroy, dated 3.15 p.m. to-day, which is as follows:—

"Malak Pass captured yesterday, 3rd April. The pass was very difficult and stoutly held by 3,000, chiefly Mullahs and Sheikhs and their followers, Upper Ranizais, Utman Khels, and Adamzais. Gatherings on Morah and Shahkot Passes had no time to join. Advance was made by our infantry in several columns, and the heights were ultimately carried at the point of the bayonet. Artillery and Maxims co-operated with great success. Enemy lost at least 500, and probably more. Our casualties not yet known fully, but reported as fifty in second brigade alone. First brigade advance to Swat river to-day (4th), and the second follow when pass is fit for camels."

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EXPENDITURE OF THE INDIAN REVENUES. ROYAL COMMISSION TO BE APPOINTED.

Mr. Samuel Smith asked the Secretary of State for India at what date he proposed to redeem the pledge given by him in this House on the 15th of August last, to the effect that he undertook at the very commencement of this Session to propose the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the financial expenditure of the Indian revenues both in England and in India.

Mr. George Russell: The Secretary of State, in accordance with his statement on the debate on the Address, will advise Her Majesty to appoint a Royal Commission to conduct the inquiry which he promised last Session.

LIEUTENANT QUILTER'S PENSION.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India whether honorary Lieutenant Quilter was granted a pension of Rs. 165 per mensem on retirement on 23rd March, 1891, and whether he would have received Rs. 240 per mensem, on succeeding to honorary Captain Ryan, if he had been permitted to count one more month of service for pension.

Whether his claim to the higher pension was strongly supported by the heads of his department and recommended by the Government of India:

Whether Lieutenant Quilter took part in the relief of Lucknow, and was rewarded with "boon" service of not less than one year on that account:

And whether, taking into consideration the fact that Lieutenant Quilter had received no benefit from his "boon" service, he would give effect to the recommendation of the Government of India.

Mr. George Russell: Lieutenant Quilter received the pension to which he was entitled by rank and length of service. It is true that the Government of India recommended an exceptional concession in his favor; but the Secretary of State in Council was unable to accept this suggestion, which appeared to him to be based on a misapprehension of the rules. The present Secretary of State sees no sufficient reason for disturbing his predecessor's decision.

AVERAGE ANNUAL INCOME IN INDIA. LORD CROMER'S STATEMENT AGAIN REFUSED.

Mr. Naoroji asked the Secretary of State for India whether as Lord Cromer had stated with regard to his statement of 1882 about the annual average income per head that although he was not prepared to pledge himself to the absolute accuracy of a calculation of this sort, it was sufficiently accurate to justify his conclusion that the taxpaying community was exceedingly poor, and as the calculation was thus accurate, he would grant the return for which a motion stood on this day's Paper, as such return was the only means of forming a fairly correct idea of the material condition of British India:

And, whether if he were unwilling to grant as a return the details of Lord Cromer's calculations, as asked in the first part of the motion, he would give an opportunity to the honourable member for Finsbury of personally inspecting them.

Mr. George Russell: Considering that the statement to which my honourable friend refers was confessedly founded upon uncertain data, and that any similar calculation which might now be made must be founded on equally uncertain data, and might probably be misleading, the Secretary of State is unable to agree to my honourable friend's motion.

REPORT OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

Mr. John Ellis asked the Secretary of State for India whether the assurance given on 11th February that the House would be in possession of the report of the Opium Commission before Easter would be realised.

Mr. George Russell: The Secretary of State has no power to give any assurance with regard to the date at which the Royal Commission may send in their report; but, having made inquiries, he has still reason to think that it may be presented by the 11th April.

BANKRUPT OFFICER AT MADRAS.

Mr. Field asked the Secretary of State for War if the circumstances connected with the bankruptcy of an officer in the Madras Staff Corps, and serving at Madras, had been brought under his notice:

And what steps it was intended to take with regard to this officer.

Mr. George Russell: The Secretary of State has no knowledge of the matter to which the hon. member's question refers, except from the documents forwarded to him by the hon. member. He will ask the Government of India to inquire into the matter.

April 6th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN CANTONMENTS.

Mr. Henry J. Wilson asked the Secretary of State for India if he would lay upon the Table the Cantonment Acts Amendment Act recently passed by the Government of India, together with any rules adopted in pursuance of the Act, and any resolution of the Government of India relating thereto.

Mr. George Russell: A copy of the Cantonments Act Amendment Act has been received, but the rules framed under the Act and the resolutions of the Government of India relating thereto are not expected to reach this country till about the end of May. The Secretary of State has no objection to laying the papers on the Table of the House.

SIR J. LAMBERT'S BILL.

Mr. Henry J. Wilson asked the Secretary of State for India if he would lay upon the Table a copy of a Bill recently introduced in the Bengal Legislative Council by Sir John Lambert, conferring additional powers on the Calcutta police.

Mr. George Russell: The Secretary of State is not aware that any such Bill has been introduced.

April 8th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

Lord Ashbourne asked if there was any further news from Chitral.

Lord Reay: The following telegram has just been received:—

"From Viceroy, 8th April, 1895.

"Low reports, 7th, strong opposition to bridging operations at Aladand this morning. A large number of enemy crowned heights on the opposite side of river and fired on working parties. Umra Khan's brother was in command with a number of his cavalry and infantry. General Waterfield's Brigade, supported by 15th Bengal Infantry, advanced to force passage of river, No. 8 Mountain Battery, Royal Artillery, and Maxim of King's Own Borderers, co-operating effectively; then 11th Bengal Lancers made brilliant dash across river and attacked enemy, who had begun to bolt up valley. Eleventh pursued for miles, up to Uch, killing about 100. Fourth and 15th Bengal Infantry then forded river and occupied Chakdarra. King's Own Borderers, fording about a mile above, captured Umra Khan's fort at Thana with slight opposition. Our loss was slight—one sapper and few men and horses wounded. Camels are now crossing Malakand Pass; about 1,000 arrived Khar, 7th.

"Low reports 1st Brigade has shifted camp to site 2nd Brigade. Our casualties on 7th crossing Swat river were—2nd Battalion, King's Own Borderers, one man wounded; 11th Bengal Infantry, one man wounded; 4th Sikhs, two men drowned; Sappers, two men wounded. Enemy's loss was 150. Muhammed Shah, Umra Khan's brother, was in command of enemy, and escaped. Three regiments 3rd Brigade on Malakand Pass. Convoy camels came through 7th April. Uch and Katgola Pass will be occupied 8th. Your telegram of 5th. Progress of wounded will be reported by telegraph as soon as known."

April 9th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

RESTITUTION OF CONJUGAL RIGHTS.

Mr. Walter M'Laren asked the Secretary of State for India, with regard to the Bill called the Procedure Bill, which had recently been before the Supreme Legislative Council of India, which proposed among other things to give the courts power to prevent decrees for restitution of conjugal rights being enforced by the imprisonment of the wife, would he explain why the Government abandoned this clause, which was supported by many members and only opposed by three, one of whom was the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal:

Whether the present law that any wife in India, even though she be a child, might be imprisoned for not living with her husband had only been in force for about eighteen years:

And whether the Government would again introduce the proposed reform into the Supreme Legislative Council and endeavour to carry it.

Mr. George Russell: This clause was unanimously struck out by a Select Committee of seven members, four of whom were natives of India, on the ground that the country was not yet ripe for such a change; and a motion to restore it was lost in the Legislative Council by fifteen votes to two.

Under the present law a wife cannot be imprisoned until the court has heard and considered all objections raised by her; and I am advised that a plea of childhood, if established, would lead to the dismissal of the suit. It is the case that imprisonment in these suits was not prescribed by law until eighteen years ago, but I believe that other methods, not less objectionable, of enforcing conjugal rights were in force before that time.

I have no reason to think that the Government of India propose, in the circumstances which I have stated, to reintroduce the measure at present; but I have no doubt they will do so as soon as they consider that it can be passed with due regard to the state of public opinion in India.

THE PAY OF SURGEON-MAJOR GENERALS.

Mr. Hanbury asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was the fact that the pay of Surgeon-Major Generals' in India was reduced, from 1st April last, from Rs. 2,500 to Rs. 2,000 per month; and, if so, whether such reduction would be followed by diminished duties and responsibilities on the part of those officers:

And whether it was proposed to reduce the pay of officers of corresponding rank in India at the same time and on a similar scale.

Mr. George Russell: The number of the principal medical officers in India has been increased from three to five. The responsibilities of all except the Surgeon-Major General at headquarters have thus been reduced, and their pay is diminished accordingly. It is not proposed to reduce the pay of officers of corresponding rank in India.

THE SPEAKER'S RETIREMENT.

Sir W. Harcourt moved that the thanks of the House should be given to the Speaker for his distinguished services in the Chair for more than eleven years, and that he should be assured that the House fully appreciated the zeal, ability, and impartiality with which he had discharged the duties of his high office.

Mr. Balfour seconded the resolution, and Mr. M'Carthy, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. J. Redmond having supported it,

Mr. Naoroji said: In the peculiar position in which I am placed here I offer to you, Mr. Speaker, my most sincere and heartfelt gratitude for all the kindness and helpful counsel you have always extended to me. (Cheers.)

The resolution was carried unanimously.

April 22nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE RELIEF OF CHITRAL.

Sir D. Macfarlane asked the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether the news of the relief of Chitral had been confirmed.

Sir E. Grey: No, sir; I have not been in communication with the India Office at all.

On the motion for the adjournment of the House,

Mr. Asquith said: It may be of interest to the House to know that the Secretary of State for India has received a telegram from the Viceroy to say that the news of the relief of Chitral is confirmed. (Cheers.)

April 23rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE EXTENSION OF THE INDIAN FRONTIER.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India, if he would explain to the House what were the formal steps by which territory lying beyond the external frontiers of Her Majesty's Indian Possessions became legally incorporated within the limits of British India and vested in Her Majesty according to the provisions of section 1 of the Act for the Better Government of India, 1858.

Sir E. Grey: The Secretary of State is not aware that there are any formal steps prescribed by law for the purposes to which the honourable baronet's question refers.

WANTED: OFFICIAL MAPS OF INDIA.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, as there are no official maps of British India with reference to section 55 of 21 and 22 Vic. c. 106, he would give a list of all official maps of the whole of British India published for any purpose between the years 1853 and 1895.

Sir E. Grey: If by official maps the hon. baronet means maps published by the Government of India, a list of them (which however does not go further back than 1862) is accessible to the public in the Record Department of the India Office; and the Secretary of State does not think that any useful purpose would be served by giving a return on the subject.

EXTENT OF POPPY CULTIVATION.

Mr. Webb asked the Secretary of State for India if he would state the number of acres under poppy cultivation in the Behar and Benares Agencies respectively for each of the last four years and for the present year.

Sir E. Grey: The acreage under poppy cultivation in each Agency for the last four years has been:—Behar: 1890-91, 254,975 acres; 1891-92, 234,975 acres; 1892-93, 241,100 acres; 1893-94, 237,341 acres. Benares: 1890-91, 246,742 acres; 1891-92, 226,922 acres; 1892-93, 212,517 acres; 1893-94, 220,881 acres. No report has yet been received of the area actually under poppy cultivation during 1894-95.

THE *TIMES* AND THE OPIUM REPORT.

Mr. Henry J. Wilson asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could explain how the *Times* had been able to obtain information as to the Report of the Royal Commission on Opium before the Report was presented to Parliament.

Sir E. Grey: The Secretary of State has no information on the subject of my hon. friend's question.

Mr. H. J. Wilson: Will the Secretary of State take some steps to obtain information about it?

Sir E. Grey: I cannot make any promise on behalf of the Secretary of State for India in the matter.

PURCHASE OF MALWA OPIUM.

Mr. Schwann asked the Secretary of State for India, whether Sir James Westland, in his Budget Speech at Calcutta, was correctly reported to have stated that the Indian Government had made arrangements for the purchase of crude opium in Malwa.

Sir E. Grey: The official report of Sir James Westland's speech contains the statement cited.

The Secretary of State has no information as to the amount of Malwa opium it is intended to purchase. Such arrangements are within the discretion of the Government of India, and do not require the sanction of the Secretary of State. Similar purchases of Malwa opium for the supply of the Indian demand have been made in previous years when the supply of Bengal opium has been short.

April 25th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES IN INDIA.

Mr. Caine asked the Secretary of State for India, what steps, if any, had been taken by the various local governments and administrations in India with respect to the recommendations of the Viceroy in Council, under date 17th August, 1889, relating to discipline and moral training in schools and colleges in India:

And, whether he would call for a Return showing in what respects the several suggestions and desires of the Viceroy in Council, contained in the above-mentioned document, especially the desire that each local government and administration should, either by the appointment of a committee, or by employing selected individuals who need not be officials, or by the offer of suitable prizes, effect a revision of readers in the Government schools in a direction indicated had been carried out, and with what results.

Mr. G. Russell: The Secretary of State is not in a position to give a complete reply to the first branch of this question, but he will have no objection to call for a Return showing what has been done in the matter of revising the text-books, or to carry out any of the other suggestions of the Government of India as to which my hon. friend specially desires information.

TAXATION IN BENGAL.

Mr. Knatchbull-Huggessen asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the Government of Bengal obtained the consent of the Behar Planters' Association to the Bill for the maintenance of the Record of Rights, and for recovering the costs of Cadastral Surveys, imposing on the land of Bengal heavy additional taxation, on the express pledge of the Government that the Patwari Regulation of 1817 should be abolished:

Whether the Secretary of State in a subsequent despatch encouraged the expectation of abolition:

Whether the Government of Bengal, at the last moment, when the Bill came from the Select Committee to be passed into law by the Legislative Council, admitted the promise, but stated that they had amply redeemed it by their endeavours to get the Regulation repealed, but stated that the Government of India had decided against repeal, and that, consequently, they had struck out the repealing clause:

Whether the Mahárájá of Darbhanga, as an elected member of the Council, thereon declared that this would be generally regarded as a breach of faith on the part of the Government:

And, whether the Secretary of State would either veto the Bill or instruct the Government of India to permit the Government of Bengal to fulfil their promise.

Mr. G. Russell: It was stated by the Bengal Government that a part of their scheme was to repeal the Patwari Regulation; but the Secretary of State for India is not aware that an express pledge was given that it should be repealed.

The Secretary of State in July, 1894, assented to the proposal for repeal.

The report of the Bengal Council proceedings of the 9th March, when the Bill was discussed and referred to a Select Committee has not yet reached the Secretary of State: so he is unable to verify the quotations from speeches made at that debate. But so far as he is aware, the Select Committee have not yet reported on the Bill.

The Secretary of State is unable to say what action he will take, until he receives the Act in its final shape and the discussions of the Bengal Council thereon.

THE GOVERNMENT AND CHITRAL.

Mr. William Redmond asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, in view of the fact that the present ruler of Chitral, Amir-ul-Mulk, secured his present position by murdering his brother, it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to support Amir-ul-Mulk as ruler of Chitral.

Mr. G. Russell: As the question of the policy to be pursued in Chitral is under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government the Secretary of State must request the hon. member to postpone his question for the present.

WOMEN IN COAL MINES.

Mr. Provand asked the Secretary of State for India, if he had received any Report from the Inspector relating to the employment of women in coal mines in British India; and if not, could he say when the Report might be expected.

Mr. G. Russell: The first Report of the Inspector of Mines in India has been received, and in it the employment of women in Indian Coal Mines is discuussed.

ROYAL COMMISSIONS AND THE PRESS.

THE *TIMES* AND THE OPIUM REPORT.

A SECRETARY'S ERROR.

Mr. Caine asked the Secretary of State for India, if he was aware that the *Times* newspaper had, during the last six days devoted six columns to an analysis and criticism of the Reports of two Royal Commissions, viz., the Opium and Hemp Drugs Commissions; and that the Hemp Drugs Commission Report was commented upon by the Indian press, with copious quotations, more than two months ago; and, if so, would he cause inquiry to be made how Copies of Reports not yet presented to Parliamant had got into the hands of the press:

And, was he now able to state when these two reports would be issued to Members of this House.

Mr. Dodd: I would like to ask the Secretary of State for India whether these two reports were sent to all the principal London papers at the same time or only to the *Times*; and, if only to the *Times*, why that paper alone was selected?

Mr. G. Russell: The Secretary of State has seen the notices to which my hon. friend refers.

The Report of the Hemp Drugs Commission with the orders of the Government of India thereon have been published in India.

The Secretary of State has been informed by the Secretary to the Opium Commission that owing to an unfortunate misapprehension on his part of the practice in such matters a copy of the Report was prematurely shown by him to a representative of the press. His error has been pointed out to him. (Laughter.)

The Secretary of State will be happy to lay a copy of the Hemp Drugs Commission Report on the Table if my hon. friend will move for it. The Report of the Royal Commission on Opium will be laid upon the Table this evening.

Mr. DODD asked whether the error was confined to one paper only.

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL: My hon. friend continues to ask me for information which I do not possess. I would tell him if I knew, but I do not. (Laughter.)

THE CASE OF SURGEON-MAJOR SMITH.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India if he was now able to state his decision in the case of Surgeon-Major Smith, lately dismissed by the Government of Madras, who appealed to the Secretary of State against his dismissal on the 18th of January last:

And, if he would lay the Papers relating to this case upon the Table of the House.

Mr. G. RUSSELL: The case of Surgeon-Major Smith is still under the consideration of the Secretary of State.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI. Supplement No. 4. JUNE, 1895.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from April 30th to May 24th.

Imperial Parliament.

April 30th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

REPORT OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

The final Report of the Commissioners was presented, namely: Vol. VI. (Part I.—Report, with annexures); Vol. VII. (Part II.—Historical Appendices, with index of witnesses and subjects, and glossary of Indian terms).

May 2nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

REPORT OF THE HEMP DRUGS COMMISSION.

Mr. CAINE asked the Secretary of State for India if he was aware that the Report of the Hemp Drugs Commission, appointed by the Government of India in consequence of action taken in this House, was, as long ago as August of last year, distributed to the *Times of India*, the *Pioneer*, and the *Englishman*:

Could he state on what date the Report was published in India, and on what date copies were received at the India Office:

If he was aware that the honourable member for Bradford, on whose initiative the Commission was appointed, applied to the India Office for a copy of the Report on 22nd September, 1894, three weeks after it had been reviewed by the Anglo-Indian press, and had made repeated applications since, but only received a copy last Saturday:

If it was possible for this Report to be procured by the general public:

And if it was intended to distribute it to Members of this House, and place a copy, with the volumes of evidence, in the Library of this House.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: My answer to the first of my hon. friend's questions is in the negative. I do not know when the Report was published in India, but the orders of the Government of India on the Report were published on the 23rd March last. An advance copy of the Report alone reached me on the 14th November last, I cannot verify the precise dates, though I am aware that repeated applications for the Report were made by my hon. friend; but it did not appear to me to be desirable to make its contents known until I could at the same time communicate the orders of the Government of India, which did not reach me until the 5th April. The Report cannot, so far as I am aware, be obtained in this country; but I shall be happy to lay it on the Table, with the orders of the Government of India, if the hon. member will move for them.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

Mr. SEYMOUR KEAY asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to a speech delivered by Lord Elgin in the Viceregal Council early last month, in which he admitted that the Government of India foresaw that if anything happened to Nizam-ul-Mulk, the ruler of Chitral, the position of any British officer who might be then in Chitral would be one of extreme danger:

Would he explain why Lieutenant Gurdon was nevertheless allowed to visit that place in mid-winter with an escort of only ten men:

Whether he had observed from the published reports that the British Political Officer, Mr. Robertson, wrote to Lieutenant Gurdon on 8th January ordering him not to make his way back with his men owing to the badness of the road between Chitral and Mastuj, although, at the same time, Mr. Robertson was able successfully to send forward another fifty men to join him by the same road:

Whether he had observed that Lord Elgin in his speech justified the sending forward of the fifty men on the ground that it was essential that Lieutenant Gurdon should be either supported or relieved:

Could he explain why, instead of relieving and withdrawing Lieutenant Gurdon from Chitral, the Government of India ordered Mr. Robertson to follow him there; and what was their object in doing so:

And whether, in regard to the points above noticed, the Government of India had acted on their own responsibility, or whether they had had the consent of Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER: The statements (1 to 4) extracted by the hon. member from the Viceroy's speech in Council are correct, save that the fifty men referred to were ordered up from Mastuj by Lieutenant Gurdon himself, being part of his own escort, not sent forward by Dr. Robertson.

As was explained to the House on the 21st March, in answer to a question of the hon. member for Banffshire, the Government of India had been asked by Amir-ul-Mulk to recognise him as Mehtar, and they ordered Dr. Robertson to enquire and report as to the propriety of doing so.

The Government of India in this matter acted, as is usual and proper, on their own initiative and responsibility.

Dr. MACGREGOR: Arising out of that answer, while I admire he heroism of my fellow countrymen in Chitral, I would ask the right hon. gentleman can he state to the House what business we have in Chitral at all, and what right we have invading a territory against the will of the natives, and putting them to death in defence of their homes?

Mr. H. FOWLER: I should like to correct a statement of the hon. member. We have not invaded a territory. We are rescuing the representatives of the Queen and people of Great Britain who have been attacked. (Cheers.) The whole policy of the future relations between this country and Chitral is a matter that is now engaging the most anxious attention of

Her Majesty's Government, and when they have fully considered the policy they think best it will be announced to the House. (Cheers.)

THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY IN CHITRAL.

Mr. **William Redmond** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, in view of the fact that the present ruler of Chitral, Amir-ul-Mulk, secured his present position by murdering his brother, it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to support Amir-ul-Mulk as ruler of Chitral.

Mr. **H. H. Fowler**: The question of the policy to be pursued in Chitral is under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS.
PETITIONERS SAID TO HAVE BEEN FINED.

Mr. **Naoroji** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would inquire whether, in Gujrat (Punjab), in May or June last year, Nawab Mohomad Afzul Khan, Deputy Commissioner, fined several teachers of the board school for signing a petition to the House of Commons in favour of simultaneous examinations:

And, whether he would take steps to prevent a recurrence of such conduct.

Mr. **H. H. Fowler**: I have no information on the subject of my hon. friend's question, but I will make enquiry.

THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Sir **Seymour King** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he could now indicate when a decision on the grievances of the Indian Staff Corps might be expected.

Mr. **H. H. Fowler**: The Secretary of State for War after consultation with the Commander-in-Chief, has informed me that he is unable to concur in the recommendation of the Government of India with respect to an alteration in the rules of promotion of officers of the Staff Corps. It has, therefore, been decided that no change shall be made in the present rules.

Majors and Captains of the Staff Corps permanently appointed Commandants and Seconds-in-Command of Native Regiments will be given a step of temporary rank.

THE PROPOSED POLICE BILL.

Mr. **Thomas Owen** asked the Secretary of State for India, if his attention had been called to the dangers likely to arise in administering the proposed Police Bill for the prohibition of solicitation in public places in India, a draft of which appeared in the *Gazette of India* of 23 January, 1895:

And whether he had advised the Government in India to give to the Bill very careful consideration before its final enactment.

Mr. **H. H. Fowler**: I have seen the letter referred to by my hon. friend.

The Penal Code provides for the punishment of any breach of the rules laid down by Government.

THE INDIAN CANTONMENTS.

Mr. **Thomas Owen** asked the Secretary of State for India, if his attention had been called to an article published in the *Times of India* of 13th March, 1895, over the signature, "A Married Officer," showing that there was a strong movement in the Indian Army for acting contrary to the Resolution of the House of Commons and the recent legislation in India for the Amendment of the Cantonments Acts:

And, if he would state what provisions the recent legislation made for the prevention of violations of the purpose of its enactment.

Mr. **H. H. Fowler**: The dangers likely to arise were pointed out by members of the Bengal Council who have been added to the Select Committee appointed to revise the provisions of the Bill. I have no doubt that the Bill will receive most careful consideration and I have not thought it necessary to issue any special instructions on the subject.

May 6th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN CANTONMENTS.

On the Motion of Mr. Stansfeld an address was granted for Copies or Extracts from recent correspondence between the India Office and the Government of India on the subject of the Cantonment Acts and Regulations.

STRENGTH OF THE BRITISH ARMY IN INDIA.

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India, what was the established strength of the British Army in India:

By what statute or ordinance was it regulated:

Why was there excess over established strength of the British Army in India in the financial year 1894-5:

And, whether such excess was legal.

Mr. **H. H. Fowler**: The established strength of the British Army in India is 73,168 officers and men. It is not regulated by any statute or ordinance.

There was a slight excess during part of the year 1894-5 owing to the drafts sent out to meet the loss by death, invaliding and other causes between the end of one trooping season and the beginning of the next.

The excess is legal.

BRITISH SOLDIERS AND INDIAN REVENUES.

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India under what statute was the application of the revenues of India to the maintenance of a British Army in India provided for:

Whether there was any provision for spending the revenues of India upon any excess over the established strength of the British army:

And whether the application of Rx. 35,000 to meet this excess, as shown in paragraph 27 of the Financial Statement of the Government of India for 1895-6, was legal.

Mr. **H. H. Fowler**: The application of the revenues of India to the maintenance of a British army in India is not governed by statute other than the general statutory provision which places the expenditure of Indian revenues for Indian purposes under the control of the Secretary of State for India in Council.

The payment of the charge for the slight excess over the established strength of the army during a part of 1894-5 was quite legal.

THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER.

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India whether the red line shown on the sketch map of the north-west frontier of the Punjab, at page 91 of Part IV. of the Statement of the Progress and Condition of India for the year 1859-60, represents the north-west frontier of British India from the Lehree Boundary Pillar on the south to Hazara and the Kunhar River on the north in 1860.

Mr. **H. H. Fowler**: I have no doubt that the sketch map of 1860 to which the hon. member refers was drawn with due care at that date and upon the information then available, but I am not in a position to answer for its correctness.

THE ANNUAL EXODUS TO SIMLA.

Sir **William Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India how much had been spent up to the present time on Government buildings and offices at Simla:

How much additional expense was thrown upon the Revenues of India by the annual removal of the seat of Government from Calcutta to Simla, and by the cost of communications and the transport of supplies to and from Simla, a distance of nearly 1,200 miles:

And under what heads was the cost of this removal of the seat of Government, direct and indirect, shown in the accounts of the Government of India.

Mr. **H. H. Fowler**: (1) The expenditure on the Government buildings and offices at Simla has been about Rx. 790,000.

(2) The extra annual cost incurred by the transfer of the Government to Simla and back was shown as Rx. 72,415 in 1883-4, in Parliamentary Paper 17 (Sess. 2) of 1886. But in 1889 fresh rules were made, by which the allowances were reduced by Rx. 12,600, so that the gross cost is now about Rx. 60,000. But, as explained in that paper, there are receipts to the extent of about Rx. 20,000, which may be set against this. No "supplies" are transported at the public expense, in consequence of the move to Simla during the summer.

(3) The allowances given to the several departments on account of the move are, in the accounts, included in the pay, etc., of those departments, and are not shown separately. They were given in the foregoing return for five years under each department.

Mr. Cayzer asked whether it was not necessary, on grounds of health for European officials, to move to Simla in the hot season?

Mr. H. Fowler said that that had been the opinion of successive Viceroys.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

Dr. MacGregor asked the Secretary of State for India, if he would consider the propriety of recognising the heroic conduct of Dr. Robertson in defending Chitral, and also of Dr. Whitchurch who, while carrying a wounded officer off the field, had to fight his way back to the fort at the point of the bayonet.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I can assure my hon. friend that I in common with every member of this House enthusiastically admire the brilliant heroism of the defence and of the relief of Chitral. When I am in a position to submit to her Majesty the names recommended for special marks of her favour I shall not overlook the distinguished claims of Dr. Robertson and Dr. Whitchurch.

May 7th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PREMATURE DISCLOSURE OF THE OPIUM REPORT.

MR. FOWLER "GREATLY REGRETS" THE OCCURRENCE.

Mr. John Ellis asked the Secretary of State for India, at what date Mr. J. A. Baines, the Secretary of the Commission on Opium, prematurely communicated the Report of the Commission to a particular newspaper, in the columns of which a summary of the Report appeared on 22nd April:

Whether, on more than one occasion during April, the latest being on the 22nd, Mr. Baines wrote to the representative of a press organisation saying information as to the Report should be given to the press as soon as he was at liberty to do so:

And, when Members of this House might expect to be in possession of the Report.

Sir Joseph Pease: Before the right hon. gentleman answers, I should like to ask him whether he is aware that the members of the Commission resident in this country did not receive their copies of the Report until a week after it appeared in the daily papers?

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I am unable to answer the question of the hon. baronet, but I may say that I have only myself received this morning my own complete copy of the Report. With regard to the question of the hon. member for Nottinghamshire, the Secretary of the Opium Commission understood that the Report would be laid on the Table of the House on Monday the 22nd April, and on Saturday the 20th he communicated the Report to a member of the press who stated that he represented several newspapers. It was not until the morning of the 22nd that Mr. Baines learnt that the Report would not be presented until the 25th. I have already stated I greatly regret this occurrence.

The answer to the second question is in the affirmative.

The Report was circulated on Saturday last.

Mr. Webb asked the Secretary of State for India, whether any further official notice would be taken of the action of the Secretary of the Opium Commission in prematurely disclosing a copy of the Report.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I do not propose to take any further action in this matter.

May 9th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

A SEVERE SENTENCE.

Mr. Caine asked the Secretary of State for India if his attention had been directed to the report of a sentence of five years' rigorous imprisonment inflicted by the Sessions Judge at Howrah upon a prisoner charged before him with stealing a few vegetables from a field; and, if so, would he call for an inquiry into the truth of the report.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I have not seen any report of such a case, but I am informed that the man must have been an habitual offender, or he would not have been committed to the Sessions. Every sentence passed by a Sessions Court is reported to the High Court, and the High Court can revise it either of its own motion or upon petition by the person sentenced.

If my hon. friend will supply me with the facts of this case, I will consider whether further inquiry should be made.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

Mr. Seymour Keay asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could state approximately the strength of the military escorts and supports available in any case of emergency for the protection of the British political officers in the Native States of Haidarabad, Mysore, Indore, and Gwalior:

What was the strength of the military escorts and supports possessed by the British political officers at Gilghit and Chitral respectively before the murder of Nizam-ul-Mulk, the ruler of Chitral, by his brother on 1st January last:

When did Nizam-ul-Mulk succeed to the throne, and what happened to his predecessor:

And for how long a period had a British political officer been in Chitral before the murder of Nizam-ul-Mulk.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I do not consider it to be in the public interest to answer the first question of the hon. member.

At the date of the murder of Nizam-ul-Mulk the whole force under the Gilghit command numbered about 3,000 men, of whom 100 represented the escort of the assistant political officer in Chitral whose station was at Mastuj. Besides his escort of 100 men, there were 700 men distributed on the route between Gilghit and Mastuj.

Nizam-ul-Mulk became Mehtar in November, 1892, after deposing his uncle Sher Afzul.

A British political officer was sent to Chitral at the end of 1892 at the request of the then Mehtar, Nizam-ul-Mulk, and has been maintained in Chitral since.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

Mr. Seymour Keay asked the Secretary of State for India, whether it was the intention of the Government to recommend that the inquiry into Indian affairs should take place before a Parliamentary Committee or Royal Commission:

And, if the latter, what opportunity would be afforded to the House to discuss the terms of reference to be made to the said Royal Commission.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: No inquiry into Indian affairs has been proposed by her Majesty's Government. On the contrary I distinctly refused to be a party to any such inquiry. It is proposed that the inquiry into Indian Expenditure should be conducted by a Royal Commission. It is not usual to discuss in this House the terms of a reference to a Royal Commission.

THE FRONTIERS OF BRITISH INDIA.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would place upon the Table of the House a sketch map showing by a red line the present external frontiers of British India upon the west and north-west so far as known and indicating wherein the present external frontiers differ from those existing in 1860.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I will consult the Government of India as to the preparation of such a sketch map as is referred to by the hon. baronet.

INDIAN ARMY OFFICERS.

Mr. Henniker Heaton asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that much discontent exists among the officers of the Indian Army owing to their frequent supersession by officers of several years' shorter service from the British Army, and the consequent ruin of their professional prospects:

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I am not aware that the officers of the Indian Army are superseded by officers of several years shorter service from the British Army. With respect to the Rules of Promotion in the Indian Staff Corps I, on the second of this month, replied to a question by the hon. member for Hull.

RAILWAY EXTENSION IN CEYLON.

Mr. Caine asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies if the attention of the Secretary of State had been called to the demand for farther railway extension in Ceylon; and had he considered the desirability of encouraging the construction of railways and feeding lines of tramways by private enterprise in that colony; and, if so, would he instruct the Government of Ceylon to afford encouragement and grant facilities to those who might be desirous of promoting and constructing such lines.

Mr. Sydney Buxton: The Government of Ceylon has shown great enterprise in extending the railway system of the colony, and there seems therefore no occasion to send any special instructions to them on the subject. Any well-considered scheme which may be brought to the notice of the Secretary of State will, of course, receive attention.

May 13th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

CONVEYANCE OF RAILS TO CALCUTTA.

Sir **George Baden-Powell** asked the Secretary of State for India whether a contract for conveying to Calcutta 11,000 tons of Middlesborough rails had been given to the German "Hansa" Line of steamers, for the reason that the German tender was 6d. per ton lower than any English tender, making a total difference on the contract of £275:

Whether he was aware that in the case of loss by collison by fault of the captain the only redress against a German ship was recovery of the sunken wreck, whereas a British shipowner would be liable up to £8 per ton register:

Whether the matter of insurance had hitherto been considered of such importance by the Secretary of State for India that he had refused shipowners the benefit of the negligence clause:

And, whether he could state what steps had been taken in this case to insure the said rails, and at what cost.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: No contract for conveying rails to Calcutta has been entered into on behalf of the Secretary of State for India with any foreign firm; the shipment of Government stores being confined to vessels sailing under the British flag. In cases where the manufacturer undertakes to deliver goods in Calcutta at his own risk, he of course chooses his own means of conveyance.

RULES UNDER THE CANTONMENTS ACTS.

Sir **Andrew Scoble** asked the Secretary of State for India, if he would agree to the Motion for a Copy of the Rules made under the Indian Cantonments Act.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I have already agreed to a motion by the right hon. member for Halifax in compliance with which a copy of the rules made under the Indian Cantonments Act will be laid on the Table of the House.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

UMRA KHAN AND THE AMIR.

Mr. Seymour Keay asked the Secretary of State for India, whether the news had been confirmed that Umra Khan had been interned by the Amír of Afghanistan, and would he be handed over to the Indian Government:

Whether this Umra Khan was the chief of the same name who in 1891-2 was engaged in raiding on the territories of the Amír in the districts around Asmar:

Whether, on that occasion, when the Amír's commanders proposed to make reprisals, His Highness was warned by the Indian Government against doing so, on the ground that Umra Khan's territory was outside the sphere of influence of Afghanistan:

Could he state to the House the terms of the ultimatum which was recently sent to Umra Khan by the Indian Government, and was it received by him before the British troops crossed the British frontier on 2nd April:

And, could he also give the terms of the proclamation by the Indian Government to the surrounding tribes.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I have no official confirmation of the statement that Umra Khan has been interned by the Amír and will be handed over to the Indian Government. My answer to the second and third clauses of the hon. member's question is in the affirmative: but Asmar was not occupied by the Afghans at the time referred to. The terms of the ultimatum and of the proclamation will be included among the papers to be presented to Parliament, but I am not yet in a position to say when the presentation may take place.

The proclamation of the Indian Government has already been published in the press.

OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL LIST.

Sir **Richard Temple** asked the Secretary of State for India with reference to the Officers of the General List Indian Army, in view of a collective promise with reference to promotion and pension made to all Indian Officers, including the cadet who entered the Service up to 1861, that is to say, the Officers now complaining of unequal treatment, by a Despatch of Sir Charles Wood, then Secretary of State, published to the Indian Army as G.G.O. 632, of 4th August, 1864, would he explain whether the assurances "promotion through every grade with the pay thereunto belonging," and the right to Indian pension maintained, include the grade of Colonel with Colonel's allowances, mentioned in paragraph 81.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The passage in the order of 1864 quoted by the hon. member refers to the prospects of promotion and pension under the rules then in force, including the succession to the Colonel's allowance, but, as regards the Officers who entered the Service since 1858, this promise is subject to any change that might be introduced into the Service.

HIGHLANDERS AT RAWAL PINDI.

Mr Rentoul asked the Secretary of State for War, whether his attention had been called to a statement that the Gordon Highlanders stationed at Rawal Pindi were, in general, Presbyterian in religion, and that they were without a Presbyterian chaplain;

And, whether this was a fact; and, if so, whether a Presbyterian chaplain would be appointed.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I will inquire into the facts of this case as to which I have at present no information except that, according to the returns, rather more than half the Gordon Highlanders are Presbyterians.

May 14th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INVASION OF CHITRAL.

Sir **W. Wedderburn** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would state what amount of breech-loading rifles, and what amount of amunition, had from time to time been given by the Government of India to successive Mehtars of Chitral; what amount to Umra Khan; and what amount Umra Khan was allowed by the Government of India to purchase in India:

With what object the rifles and ammunition were given; and whether they had been used against our troops during the recent fighting in Chitral:

Whether the statement made by Captain Younghusband at a meeting of the Geographical Society, as reported in the *Times* of the 25th March last, to the effect that "Nizam-ul-Mulk started from Gilghit with the support of Colonel Durand, and with that was able to turn out Sher Afzul," was correct; if so, what offence had Sher Afzul given the Government of India at that time so as to justify our Agent in supporting against him another pretender to the Mehtarship of Chitral;

Whether Colonel Durand acted in this matter under the orders of the Government of India, and whether such action was consistent with the policy of recognising the *de facto* ruler of Chitral:

Whether at the forcing of the Malakand Pass about 500 Swat tribesmen were killed, and about 1,500 wounded:

Whether the Swat tribes live in independent territory:

Whether the Government of India had any right, by treaty or prescription, to march troops through that territory:

And, whether on this occasion the Swat tribes had agreed to troops being marched through their territory; and, if not, for what offence the losses above referred to were inflicted on them.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: My hon. friend has put to me fifteen separate questions dealing with the policy and details of the recent Chitral relief expedition. In due course papers relating to that expedition will be laid upon the Table of the House; but in the meantime it is impossible to give by means of question and answer a history of the circumstances connected with these operations.

EMPIRE OF INDIA EXHIBITION.

Mr. Keir-Hardie asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been drawn to a forthcoming exhibition in London called the Empire of India Exhibition:

Whether he was aware that several Native Indian Princes had received applications to send over Indian workpeople and various Indian treasures to the exhibition; and that those applications bore the imprint of names of various Indian officials (retired or otherwise):

And, whether he would take immediate steps to inform the Indian Princes concerned that there was no Governmental connection with this exhibition.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I am aware that an Indian exhibition is being prepared, but I have no information regarding applications to Indian Princes, such as are described in the hon. member's question. It was announced in the *Bombay Gazette* of the 7th February, 1895, that "the exhibition was a purely private adventure, the Government of India having decided to take no part in it."

I do not propose to take any steps in the matter: I believe that Indian Princes are not likely to be misled as to the facts of the case.

BRITISH-INDIAN SUBJECTS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

Mr. Arnold-Forster asked the under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention had been called to a statement in the *Johannesburg Times* of February 1, to the effect that a field-cornet of the name of Bodenstein had forcibly expelled certain British subjects from the town of Krugersdorp on the on the ground that they were Asiatics; whether the persons expelled were British subjects and natives of India; and whether the law of the Boer Republic permitted the expulsion of British subjects from Boer territory on no other ground than that of their nationality; and, if so, whether the Sikh soldiers and policemen now being enlisted under the authority of the Crown for service in South Africa were liable to be subjected to a similar indignity in case they crossed the Boer frontier.

Mr. Buxton: We have not yet received the report of the High Commissioner on the statement in question, which was referred to him a few weeks ago. The legal position of British-Indian subjects in the Transvaal being open to doubt, the question was lately referred to arbitration, and we have only just received the report of the arbitrator. As regards the Sikh soldiers in Nyasaland referred to by the hon. gentleman, I do not think it probable that any question will arise in regard to them, as the frontier of the South African Republic is at least 500 miles from the place where they will be stationed.

Mr. Arnold-Forster asked whether there was any precedent for making distinctions of this kind between British subjects in accordance with the colour of their skins.

Mr. Buxton asked for notice of the question.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

Mr. Seymour Keay asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was within his recollection that a pledge was given by him to the House on 15th August last that, if the hon. member for Flintshire would withdraw his Motion for an inquiry into the condition of the people of India, the right hon. gentleman would undertake, on the part of the Government, that at the very commencement of the present Session they would propose the appointment of a Select Committee which would inquire into the financial expenditure of the Indian revenues, both in England and in India, and also a pledge that it would be open to any member of the House, when the Motion for the appointment of the Committee was made, to submit any amendment he thought necessary in regard to the terms of the reference to be made to such Committee:

And, whether, with a view to implement these pledges, Her Majesty's Government would give an opportunity to members of this House to discuss the terms of the reference to the Royal Commission which had been appointed as a substitute for the Select Committee originally offered to the House by the Government on 15th August last.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: It is quite true that in August last I did promise an inquiry into the expenditure of the Indian revenues, both in England and in India, and, as I intimated then, I thought that such an inquiry should be conducted through the instrumentality of a Parliamentary Committee. I also stated—but I gave no pledge—that, of course, any hon. member could move an amendment upon any Motion made in this House. But in the debate upon the Address this Session the whole question was discussed again, and I then explained to the House the objection that had been raised to the constitution of a Parliamentary Committee to deal with this subject—namely, that such a Committee would be confined to members of Parliament, and that other gentlemen who were specially qualified to deal with the question, who were in fact experts, would be excluded. Another objection taken was that, in the not improbable contingency of an early dissolution of Parliament, a Parliamentary Committee would come to an end, and its labours would be rendered futile. Therefore I stated that it was desirable to conduct the inquiry by Royal Commission, and I gathered that the view which I then took was endorsed by the general sense of the House. My colleagues and myself, therefore, came to the conclusion that a Royal Commission would be the best mode of inquiry, and yesterday the names appeared in the newspapers of those gentlemen whom her Majesty has been pleased to approve of as constituting that Commission. I have endeavoured to constitute the Commission as fairly and impartially as possible, and every section of opinion interested in Indian finance is represented upon it. It is not in harmony with the usual practice of this House to discuss the terms of the reference to a Royal Commission.

May 16th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BRITISH AMMUNITION IN CHITRAL.

Colonel Howard Vincent asked the Secretary of State for India if there was any truth in the report that large quantities of British Government arms and ammunition had been found in the possession of the enemy in Chitral:

And, in such case, if he would direct a most searching inquiry to be instituted as to how they were obtained, with a view to the adoption of prompt legislative or other steps in conjunction with other departments to prevent the possibility of the recurrence of a state of affairs so prejudicial to British interests.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: I have as yet no complete information on the subject to which the hon. member's question refers: but I have no doubt the Government of India are investigating the matter, and the hon. member may rely upon its receiving due attention.

TRANSFER OF RAILWAY STOCKS.

Mr. Bartley asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that in the transfer of some of the Indian Guaranteed Railway Stocks the Companies required a certificate of burial in the case of the death of one of the holders, and would not accept a certificate of death:

Whether he was aware that this often involved great difficulty and delay:

And, whether he would consider the advisability of altering this requirement in future.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The Indian Guaranteed Railway Companies are administered by their respective Boards of Directors. I have ascertained that though the procedure followed by each of the Companies varies somewhat in detail, the general practice is to accept either certificates of death or of burial.

THE CASE OF MR. KUNHI KANNAN.

Mr. Seymour Keay asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been directed to the case of Mr. Kunhi Kannan, deputy collector and magistrate of Calicut, in the Madras Presidency, who was some years ago tried, convicted, and imprisoned on a charge of having taken a bribe from an accused person whom he had tried in his capacity as magistrate:

Whether he was aware that the conviction of Mr. Kunhi Kannan rested almost entirely on the evidence of this accused person, who swore that he had had to call in a certain sum which was due to him on a mortgage, which sum he had handed over to Mr. Kunhi Kannan:

Whether he was aware that since Mr. Kunhi Kannan's conviction evidence had been forthcoming, in the shape of proceedings in a court of law, which proved that the sum which was due on the mortgage had not been called in, and therefore could not possibly have been paid to Mr. Kunhi Kannan:

Whether he was aware that the Madras Government, on whose prosecution he was convicted, had refused to grant any inquiry into this case, or any redress for the wrongful conviction to which he declared that he could prove he had been subjected:

And, whether Her Majesty's Government would take any steps to secure that an opportunity be afforded to Mr. Kunhi Kannan to establish his innocence.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: In consequence of a question put by my hon. friend the member for East Bradford last year this case was fully considered, and I have nothing to add to the reply which I gave on the 2nd April, 1894.

THE MAHARAJA OF BHARTPUR.

Mr. Seymour Keay asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he had received the report called for from the Government of India regarding the alleged setting aside of the Máháràja of Bhartpur from the government of his State:

Whether he was aware that the present Máháràja only ascended the throne on the death of his father about fourteen months ago; and that the Government of India notified that the British Resident would conduct the government for a period of twelve months:

And, could he state the grounds on which the Máháràja had been set aside.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: My reply to the 1st and 2nd questions of the hon. member is in the affirmative. As to the 3rd question, the Government of India were satisfied of the incapacity of the Máháràja to discharge his duties as Ruler of the State and I have officially approved of their action.

LEAVE AND PENSION RULES.

Sir Seymour King asked the Secretary of State for India whether a despatch was sent home in January last, conveying the recommendations of the Indian Government on the subject of leave and pension rules for the European officials (non-civilian) in the Indian Service:

And when a decision might be expected.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: Such a despatch was received, and a reply was sent on the 11th of April giving the Secretary of State's decision on most of the points mentioned; but in a few cases the Government of India were asked to reconsider their proposals.

GOVERNMENT CONCESSIONS TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India whether, when the Government of India became entitled some years ago to purchase the Great Indian Peninsular Railway, the Bombay and Baroda Railway, and other railways in the West of India, they waived that right for a period of years; and, if so, what was the yearly loss now to the revenues of India due to such waiver:

What consideration did the railway companies give for the concession, and what gain was now accruing to the revenues of India from the consideration given by the railway companies:

And, whether he would lay the whole correspondence upon the Table of the House.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: In 1870, the Secretary of State relinquished his right to purchase on the first opportunity and modified the contracts of the companies in the circumstances described in paragraph 8 of the Railway Report for 1869-70 by the Government Director of Indian Railway Companies.

I cannot say what has been the pecuniary advantage or disadvantage of the modifications of the contracts, as I do not know what would have been the price at which the railways could have been purchased by Government under the terms of the original contracts.

Correspondence on the subject was presented to the House in 1879.

INDIAN CADETS.

Sir Seymour King asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had considered the case of the survivors of sixteen candidates who passed into Addiscombe at the first examination, held in December 1859, under paragraph 17 of the regulations for admission for cadet-ships in the Engineers and Artillery of Her Majesty's Indian Forces under Clause 34 of the Acts of 21 and 22 Vic., chap. 166:

Whether, after being sworn in as Indian Cadets, they were after the decision was taken to amalgamate the Services, sent for and informed by Sir Frederick Abbott, the Governor of Addiscombe, that it was not proposed to appoint any more Officers to the Indian Artillery and Engineers, but that these cadets would retain all their rights and not be losers by the change, and by a similar promise, when they joined at Woolwich as Commissioned Officers, were induced to volunteer for general service, and in fact were appointed to and served in India, and were furthermore paid the £100 promised to those who obtained Commissions in the Artillery and Engineers of the Indian Forces, by the regulations under which they were examined for cadet-ships, and were in effect treated as if they had passed into the Indian Service:

And whether, as one of the four surviving Officers concerned had recently been retired upon a pension of £450 a year, instead of the Indian pension to which he was entitled, it was proposed to adopt the same course with the remaining three Officers concerned:

And, if so, on what ground the engagement entered into with these gentlemen by the Indian Government was now annulled.

Mr. Woodall: These Officers entered as students at Addiscombe with the expectation of joining the Indian Artillery or Engineers; but before their college course was finished, appointments to those corps had ceased, in consequence of the transfer of the Indian Government to the Crown; and as the only military opening available they joined the Royal Engineers. The Officers were never in the Indian Corps; and I regret to say that their claim to be treated for pension as if they had been in those corps cannot be recognised. There is no record of any authority having been given to the Governor of Addiscombe to hold out any such promise to the Cadets, as is referred to in the hon. members question.

BRITISH INDIAN SUBJECTS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

Mr. Arnold-Forster asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it was the fact that peaceable British subjects, natives of India, were liable to be expelled without trial from the Transvaal; and, if so, what was the crime alleged or disqualification on account of which these British subjects were punished; and whether the Government would take steps to make public in India the fact that natives entering the Transvaal were liable to expulsion without trial and with violence by subordinate military officers in the employment of the Boer Government, so that intending emigrants might not be exposed to unnecessary indignities.

Mr. Sydney Buxton: The hon. member is mistaken in supposing that British Indian subjects can be expelled without trial from the Transvaal. The Government does not propose to take the steps suggested in the second part of the question.

Mr. Arnold-Forster, pressing for a further answer,

Mr. Sydney Buxton explained that the dispute had been referred to arbitration. The report of the arbitrator had only just been received, and there had not been time to consider it.

Mr. Arnold-Forster: The hon. gentleman has four times declined to give an answer. Can he tell us what were the alleged grounds upon which these British subjects were deprived of the opportunity of earning their own living?

Mr. Sydney Buxton: The complaint against them was the infringement of certain local sanitary laws. I have not refused in any case to answer the hon. member. I have always informed him that an arbitrator was inquiring into the dispute, and we wished to see what the arbitrator said.

May 17th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE COTTON DUTIES.

Lord Stanley of Alderley asked her Majesty's Government whether, in consideration of the protection given to cotton duties, they would take a similar step on behalf of the silk industry by placing duties on foreign silk stuffs imported into England.

The **EARL OF KIMBERLEY**: said that the premisses on which the noble lord based his demand had no foundation whatever. There was no protection of cotton goods in India, to which he supposed the noble lord referred. The line was drawn at a certain number of counts, after careful consideration. It was drawn at the point where an excise duty was necessary for countervailing the duty laid on cotton goods. Power was reserved to the Government of India to alter the line if it were found wrong; but at present the Government did not think that it was so drawn as to give protection to cotton goods. He supposed the noble lord would expect him to use some commonplace with regard to free trade. All he could say was that this country was at present under a system founded on what was generally termed "free trade," and the Government had not the slightest intention of considering in any manner whether that system should be abandoned for the purpose of putting a protective duty on the silk industry.

May 17th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MILITARY STORES FOR INDIA.

Mr. **HANBURY** asked the Secretary of State for India, what Military stores were manufactured in India, and in what cases the stores manufactured in India formed the total supply of that kind for the British forces in that country:

Whether those stores included cordite; and, if not, when it was expected to commence the manufacture of that powder:

And, in what cases, a system of simultaneous tenders for Military stores in England and in India was adopted.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: Speaking generally all Military Stores that can be satisfactorily and economically manufactured in India are obtained in that country: but it is impossible to give a list of the stores which are wholly provided in this way.

Cordite has not yet been made in India and the question of its manufacture there is under consideration.

No system of simultaneous tenders for Military stores has been adopted.

Mr. **HANBURY** asked how long it was since the plant for the manufacture of cordite was actually sent out, and whether the delay was due to any want of confidence as to the ability of Indian manufacturers to manufacture cordite.

Mr. **FOWLER**: No, Sir, the question is entirely one of climate whether cordite can be safely manufactured in India.

May 20th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EXPENDITURE ON GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. **HENNIKER HEATON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he would lay upon the Table of the House a short Statement, or Return, showing the capital expenditure on Government buildings for the accommodation of Viceroys, Governors, Lieutenant-Governors, Chief Commissioners, and Agents of the Governor General in India during the last ten years, giving the amount spent in each province separately, with a brief note of the reasons for incurring the expenditure.

Mr. H. H. **FOWLER**: The detailed information asked for by the hon. member is not available either in the Public Works or Finance Departments of the India Office.

It could only be supplied after reference to India.

THE REPORT OF THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

Mr. **HENRY J. WILSON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether a Supplement to the Report of the Royal Commission on Opium, containing the Memorandum of the Mâhârâja of Durbhanga, would be in the hands of members before the Debate took place on Friday next.

Mr. H. H. **FOWLER**: The Memorandum will be presented to-day, and I understand that it will be distributed to hon. members on Wednesday next.

May 21st.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE DELHI-SAMASATA RAILWAY.

Sir **JAMES KITSON** asked the Secretary for India, whether he had arrived at any decision on the proposals for the construction of the Delhi-Samasata Railway, the tenders for which were submitted last year; and, if not, would he state when a decision would be come to, in order that the existing favourable conditions of finance and favourable markets for materials might be taken advantage of in the interests of India.

Mr. H. H. **FOWLER**: Revised tenders for the construction of the Delhi-Samasata railway are now before the Secretary of State in Council, and I have every reason to think that a decision on them will be arrived at early next week.

THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Mr. **HENNIKER HEATON** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that much dissatisfaction exists among the Officers of the Indian Staff Corps, owing to the fact that the rate of promotion was much more rapid in the British than in the Indian regiments serving in India, the consequence being that Officers of more years and experience in the Staff Corps constantly found themselves commanded by British Officers of much shorter service:

Whether the rates of promotion for the Staff Corps were orginally fixed with express reference to the British rates of promotion, and had remained so fixed, although the British rates had been accelerated:

Whether he was aware that the grievances arising from different rates of promotion among Officers serving side by side was recognised as long ago as 26th May, 1858, when the Court of Directors, writing to Lord Ellenborough, described them as injurious supersessions, and again in 1861, when they were described in G. G. O., No. 632, as extensive supersessions of Officers:

And, whether he would personally examine the question, and endeavour to make such alterations in the rules regarding promotion as would put an end to the grievance complained of.

Mr. H. H. **FOWLER**: On the 2nd May I answered a question of the hon. member for Hull with respect to the alleged grievances of the Indian Staff Corps. In reply to the present question I can only say that I have considered the matter, and that having consulted the Secretary of State for War and the Commander-in-Chief, I am unable, in view of the opinions which they have expressed, to make any change in the present rules for the promotion in the Staff Corps.

May 23rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE BALLADHUN MAGISTRATE AGAIN.

Mr. **CAINE** asked the Secretary of State for India, if his attention had been called to an official inquiry into the complaint of Taran Chunder Bose *v.* Aijuddy and others held at Faridpur and reported in the Indian journals of 24th April:

Was he aware that it was stated in the official report that the said Taran Chunder Bose charged Aijuddy and two others with robbery before the deputy magistrate, who submitted to the district magistrate that the evidence justified a prosecution; that the District Magistrate not only refused to prosecute Aijuddy and his accomplices, but ordered that Taran Chunder Bose should be prosecuted under section 211, I.P.C., for instituting a false case; that, on application to the High Court by Taran Chunder Bose, this order was not only set aside, but the District Magistrate was ordered to send up Aijuddy and his fellow robbers for trial at the Sessions; that eventually the persons accused of robbery were all convicted, and the conviction was upheld by the High Court on appeal:

And, whether in view of the fact that the district magistrate who refused to prosecute was the same gentleman who as District Magistrate at Balladhun was severely censured by the Calcutta High Court, and afterwards by the Viceroy in Council, for his conduct in the Balladhun murder case, he proposed to take any action in the matter.

Mr. H. H. **FOWLER**: My attention has not been called to this case, but my hon. friend has favoured me with an extract from the newspaper on which he relies.

I am not in a position to say whether the statements contained in that newspaper are correct, but I will refer the allegations to the Government of India who are the proper authority to deal with matters of this description.

FUTURE POLICY IN CHITRAL.

Mr. **Curzon** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether Her Majesty's Government had arrived at any decision concerning the future administration of Chitral, and concerning the steps that might be required for the safeguarding of British interests in that quarter, and of the lines of communication with British India; and, if so, whether he could state such decision to the House.

Mr. H. H. **Fowler**: The matters to which the hon. member's question refers are receiving the most careful attention of Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. W. **Redmond**: I would ask the right hon. gentleman whether it is true that the late ruler of Chitral has been sent to India, and, if so, whether it is proposed to keep him in India, or what the Government are going to do with him?

Mr. H. H. **Fowler**: I have no information on that point except what has appeared in the newspapers.

May 24th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN CADETS.

Sir **Seymour King** asked the Secretary of State for War whether, in 1859, Sir Frederick Abbott, who was Governor of Addiscombe College, was the representative of the East India Company in dealing with the students of the college; and, if not, whom he represented:

Whether, in 1859, a batch of sixteen students went to Addiscombe under the terms of a Royal Warrant which promised them, subject to passing through the Addiscombe course, to receive commissions in the Indian artillery and engineers:

Whether, before their college course was finished, appointments to those corps had ceased, in consequence of the transfer of the Indian Government to the Crown:

Whether, as a consequence of that cessation, it was or was not actually decided by the Government of the day to deprive these gentlemen of the benefit of the promises under which they had been induced to compete for their cadetships:

Whether, in point of fact, the then governor of Addiscombe, Sir Frederick Abbott, promised these students that the inducements held out to them to enter the college for the East India Company's service would be fulfilled by the Government of India:

Whether, in consequence of this promise, they agreed to go into the Royal Artillery and Engineers, and whether the promise was subsequently confirmed at Woolwich:

If he was aware that the gentlemen in question were prepared to make an affidavit to this effect:

Whether, on proof of such promise having been made, the Indian Government were prepared to repudiate an undertaking of the responsible authorities at Addiscombe and Woolwich:

And whether the rights of these gentlemen were protected under the Henley clause of the Government of India Act.

Mr. **Campbell-Bannerman**: The officers in question went to Addiscombe in 1859, not under any Royal Warrant, but under the conditions of appointment laid down by the Secretary of State for India. Those conditions contemplated appointment to Indian artillery or engineers; but under an Act of 1860 appointments to those corps were stopped, and the only alternatives were to cancel the nominations altogether, or to appoint the cadets to commissions in the Royal Artillery or Royal Engineers. The gentlemen who accepted the latter alternative were never officers of the Indian army, and do not come under the Henley clause in the Act of 1858. There is no record of any promise as to pension being made to them; nor had Sir F. Abbott, as Governor of Addiscombe College, which was maintained in 1859 by the Government of India, any power to give a pledge as to future prospects to officers who did not enter the local forces.

Sir **Seymour King** asked the Secretary of State for War, whether cadets from Addiscombe, who were appointed to the Imperial Cavalry and Infantry, viz., to the 19th, 20th, and 21st Hussars, and to Regiments 101st and upwards, at the same time or subsequently to the 16 cadets of 1859, who were induced to join the Royal Engineers and Artillery from Addiscombe by the promises of Sir Frederick Abbott, received, or would receive, Indian pensions, although the latter were deprived of them; and, if so, on what grounds a distinction was made against the Engineers and Artillery.

Mr. **Campbell-Bannerman**: No officers were appointed direct from Addiscombe Military College to the Imperial cavalry and infantry: but some officers, who had been at Addiscombe in 1859-60, joined the new line regiments from the general list of the Indian army; and, in common with other officers appointed from that army, were allowed prospective pensions under Indian regulations. The distinction between these officers—who were certainly very fortunate—and their contemporaries who joined the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers is that the former did join the Indian army and the latter did not.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI. Supplement No. 5. JULY, 1895.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from May 24th to June 20th.

Imperial Parliament.

May 24th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE OPIUM COMMISSION.

At the evening sitting, on the motion to go into Committee of Supply,

Sir JOSEPH PEASE rose to call attention to the Report of the Royal Commission on Opium; and to move: "That this House, having had before it its Resolution of the 30th June, 1893, pressing on the Government of India to continue their policy of greatly diminishing the cultivation of the poppy and the production and sale of opium, and having had presented to it the Report of the Royal Commission, appointed 2nd September, 1893, to enquire into various matters connected with the cultivation of the poppy in India, is of opinion that the system by which the Indian Opium Revenue is raised is morally indefensible, and would urge upon the Indian Government that they should cease to grant licences for the cultivation of the poppy and sale of opium in British India, except to supply the legitimate demand for medical purposes, and that they should at the same time take measures to arrest the transit of Malwa opium through British territory." He admitted that it was somewhat inconvenient on a Friday evening to bring before the House a subject of such importance as that which he brought before it this evening. But he felt that he must seize the earliest possible opportunity of endeavouring in the House to contradict what had been mentioned in so many journals of the day—namely, the idea that this Commission which had sat on the opium question in India had terminated for ever the question of the trade in opium, and that it met the views of those who had been opposed to this trade, and who had for many years fought against its continuance in our Indian empire. They still held that the system by which this revenue was raised was morally indefensible. He asserted, moreover, that the Report confirmed the view that this trade was morally indefensible, and that the Commission proposed action, having that proposition in view. In 1893 the hon. member for West Waterford (Mr. Webb) moved for a Royal Commission—(1) To report on the possibilities of retrenchment in India; (2) on the development of its resources; and (3) what temporary aid India would require consequent upon putting down the poppy cultivation except for medicinal purposes. That Commission was refused. A Commission was now appointed to look into the finances of the Indian empire; but they could not look into the question without also looking at the other two points—retrenchment of expenditure and the development of the resources of India. They had got now, as nearly as possible, back to the position in which his hon. friend left it *minus* the opium question. It was a singular fact that the hon. member for North Bedfordshire (Mr. George Russell), then Under Secretary of State for India, placed resolutions on the Paper; but the whole question was taken out of the hands of the Under Secretary by the right hon. member for Midlothian, whose perfervid speech carried the House. The anti-opium party in the House objected to that Commission, and voted against its appointment. They thought that the moral question had already been settled by the House; that there was ample evidence as to China and India in the Blue Book of Lord Cross, and that there was no occasion for further enquiry into this matter in India. The great source of revenue was not in India itself, where the revenue was comparatively small, but ninety per cent. of the whole of the Indian revenue was derived from trade with China and from the Straits Settlements, especially from Singapore. But the Government got their own Commission—composed of Lord Brassey, chairman; Sir James Lyall and Mr. Fanshawe, Indian officials; Sir W. Roberts, a physician; Mr. Mowbray, M.P. South-East Lancashire, who voted against the anti-opium party in 1891; the Máháràja of Durbhanga Sir Lachhmeswary Singh, and Mr. Haridas Veharidas, Natives of India; Mr. Arthur Pease, and Mr. Henry J. Wilson, M.P. On the appointment of the two last alone was he consulted. It was not the free, fair enquiry that he understood Lord Kimberley to promise. Having obtained their Commission, the Government proceeded to "dry-nurse" it. They provided it with three consecutive secretaries, Sir C. Bernard (temporary), Mr. Hewett, and Mr. Baines, all in their pay. It proceeded in its enquiry more like an excursion party. There were five ladies and the usual retinue of Indian servants. The "Sunbeam" flew her colours; at Calcutta they all lived at the Residency except Mr. Wilson; a review of troops was held. A nautch dance was provided to indoctrinate these gentlemen, who had come on a moral enquiry into the higher line of Indian morals. His hon. friend, the member for Holmfirth, was absent on that occasion. A highly competent official, Mr. Dane, was appointed to take charge of the Commission. The evidence was collated and arranged, and that which was not wanted was declined. The collectors of evidence which was to be given on the other side were watched by the police. The witnesses were drilled. The evidence of the Commission was collected by Mr. Dane, and a large quantity of it passed through the hands of the Calcutta Government. The anti-opium section was not aided to bring up a single witness. The whole power and the money of the Indian Government were against the few subscribers of the anti-opium movement. He was much struck by the manner and the style—the Old Bailey style (he said it without offence)—of Sir James Lyall in putting his interrogations. Sir James Lyall's questions were entirely directed to preserving the revenue, and they were put in a tone that would not have been tolerated at a similar enquiry in this country. He at once expostulated with Lord Kimberley, and pointed out to him that, instead of a fair and free enquiry, it was the whole force of the Indian Government against the Christian churches at home. No fair man who read that evidence and report but must be struck by the character of the pro-opium evidence—its want of experience, its want of facts, its hearsay tone and character: "We have heard," "We suppose," and "We believe," "long custom and habit," were all favourite phrases, and the extracts were garbled, partial, and unfair. This was diffused through nearly every paragraph of the Report; there was no grasp, and there was little or no positive recommendation, except on opium smoking. The Commission thought that the "use should be restricted," but they added they had not time to say in what manner it should be restricted. The Commissioners had been at home one year before this Report was laid before Parliament, and yet there had not been time to come to a conclusion. With regard to China, they left aside the whole of the China question, which was not committed to them in any of the references by saying that China would supply herself if we did not; therefore they could do nothing. No one could look at the Report without seeing who drew it up and for what purpose. The Government of India thanked the Commission for their trouble in strengthening the hands of the Government. The Commission also thanked the two paid officers who were their secretaries for having drafted their Report. No doubt the secretaries ought to have drafted the Report, but ought they to have been in the pay of the Indian Government, or ought they not rather to have been independent secretaries? He asserted that the Report was settled in the India Office. Was that a fair way of conducting the Commission? The officers of the Commission ought to have been independent officers. They did not wait, before issuing their Report, till the memorandum of the Mahárájá of Darbhanga had arrived. Did they know it was coming? The Mahárájá of Darbhanga who was on the Commission and whose memorandum was only circulated a few days ago, stated that he would put down opium smoking at once by law, that he would label every piece of opium "poison," and that he would mark on bottles containing it the minimum dose which was likely to prove fatal. The paid officers of the Indian Government occupied 240 pages of the report out of 392.

Sir Andrew Scoble: Sir James Lyall is not a paid officer of the Indian Government.

Sir Joseph Pease replied that Sir J. Lyall was in receipt of a pension from the Indian Government. (Hear, hear). Continuing, he said, that the decidedly partisan reports occupied 240 pages, while the actual and independent portion covered only 126 pages. 130 medical men were examined. Of these, 82 were official, 14 missionary, and 34 independent. Of the officials, 44 were favourable, 18 indifferent, and 20 unfavourable. All the missionaries were unfavourable to the use of opium, half the independent medical men—17 out thus of 34—and 20 officials. There were thus 57 medical on the one side, against 51 on the other. A sample of the one sidedness was shown in the report dealing with Burma (p. 92). The Commission said: "We have no suggestions to make as to the administration of the measures sanctioned by the Government of India in November, 1893, and we recommend that they be maintained unaltered till they be fairly tested by experience." Sir Charles Aitchison reported in 1880. The Indian Government held out till 1893. Sir Charles said: "Here the question is not one of better or worse morality, but the salvation of a whole people from a vice which we have introduced among them, and from ruin, which it is to a great extent in our power to retard, if not prevent." There was no time here for experiments if the people were to be saved. The Indian Government still retarded Sir Charles Aitchison's recommendations, and this Commission called it, in fact a mere experiment. Another example was as to the drugging of infants (p. 16). The arguments put forward in support of the practice was to prevent diarrhœa, to correct the mother's milk and to keep the child quiet. "It was impossible to believe that this custom should have been handed down for many centuries amongst a people whose general fondness for their children was well known, if it were as injurious as some witnesses seemed to think." The evidence as to the drugging of infants was as follows: "Surgeon Lieut.-Col. Hendly puts in summaries of replies from 55 persons at Jeypore, on the use of opium. The answers referring to children concludes; 'Baneful custom, as it causes atrophy, constipation, fever, etc., the principle cause of infantile mortality here.' Witness adds, 'The opinions of all are much the same.' In the municipal report of Lucknow for 1891, Dr. Cleghorn wrote, 'Another cause of mortality among children is the almost universal practice of giving infants opium.' Dr. Huntly states, 'I know that I have come across many deaths in children owing to an overdose of opium, and still more die from the continuance of the habit. Within a radius of half-a-mile of Jodhpore hospital I certainly can produce 20 cases.' Miss Rose Greenfield of the Charlotte Hospital, Ludhiana, said, 'Many children's lives are lost just by an overdose of opium.' She had no doubt a certain number of girls are still killed by opium intentionally. Miss Carlton, M.D., definitely confirmed this. A native witness stated 'girls are more generally drugged than boys.' Surgeon Lieut.-Col. Mayne said, 'I continually saw children given opium, and I have seen some deaths among them from its injudicious use.'" To go as fast as he could through the great Indian points. They were told that the drug was used as a prophylactic and as a febrifuge; that it was essential to cultivation; that it was difficult to arrange matters with the Native States; and that our native soldiers required it. What was the character of opium? Gloss it over as they liked, it was a poisonous drug. The great difference between alcohol and opium was this: Thousands took beer, wine, and spirits—took alcohol one day, but did not, perhaps, touch it the next, or take it to excess; whereas an opium smoker or eater must have it, or he failed in his daily task; and the evidence showed conclusively that in almost every case he must have more and more of the drug. No one objected to the use of opium purely as a drug. As to the allegations that opium was a prophylactic and a febrifuge, Rai Lal Bahadur, L.M.S., graduate in medicine and surgery, president of Calcutta Medical School, lecturer on ophthalmic medicine, and for thirty years in Government employ, examined as to its being a prophylactic, stated: "It is to my mind a new theory. It is not a theory I ever heard as a student or as a practioner;" and added, "I do not think it a remedy in fever." Moreover, a memorandum of the Government of Madras was as follows: "The Government is aware that the opium traffic is carefully watched by the agents and their assistants, and that, so far from 'teaching the people to rely on opium as a febrifuge, we are doing all we can to gradually wean them from their hereditary habit of using it on all occasions." Dr. J. R. Wallace, M.D., who had had 14 years' experience in Calcutta, both in Government service and private practice, said: "I have never seen or heard of any physician in Calcutta or elsewhere who prescribes the use of opium for the prevention or cure of malarial fever. I have recently read of the good effect of opium in preventing and even curing malarial fever. I have given the theory a fair and honest trial during the past ten or twelve months, and I am thoroughly convinced that beyond relieving the bodily pains and aches of malarial fever, it in no way prevents or shortens its paroxysms. I firmly believe that the action of opium in malarial disorders, in which there is a strong tendency to congestion of the liver, spleen, and kidneys, is not only distinctly contra-indicated, but its administration in many such cases would be undoubtedly harmful. I have frequently found serious complications follow the use of opium when given as a sedative in cases where the liver had undergone inflammatory or degenerative change from any cause. I base this opinion further upon the teaching and practice of many able and experienced Indian physicians, such men as Norman Chevers, David B. Smith, Coates, Harvey, and M'Connell, men whose lectures and practice I have attended and seen, and from whom I never heard a word of commendation for the use of opium in malarial fever; men who, as far as my recollection serves me, have always condemned the use of opium in congested conditions of the liver—a condition which, sooner or later, complicates every case of malarial fever." Then as to the cultivation and character of the opium crop and its necessity to the cultivator. It was universally admitted throughout the Blue Books, and in the Report on the "Moral and Material Progress of India," which was laid on the Table of the House of Commons in May, 1892, that the cultivation of the poppy was being reduced on account of other crops turning the poppy out of the market. It was giving place to better paying crops. From the Report on the "Moral and Material Progress of India," page 89, he quoted: "It is reported that cultivators of opium have lost heart, after experiencing three bad seasons in succession; that new cultivators are gradually withdrawing from the industry, while there is a tendency on the part of older cultivators to lessen the poppy area cultivated by them in favour of the more robust and less precarious cereals." The Behar opium agent adds: "The opium department have difficulty in maintaining their position: they cannot drop cultivation at will without losing it permanently." The problem was how to get the land back to cultivation, and that was the difficulty of the Government in 1891. In 1894, in a copy of the Resolution of the Indian Revenue Department it was stated that: "the decrease in the area of poppy cultivation was accounted for by the following reasons: (1) The policy of the Government was not to take any measures for increasing the area of cultivation; (2) a series of bad seasons, which had disheartened the opium cultivators; and (3) the cultivation of other crops." The end of that was that the Indian Government, since the Commission left India, in order to produce a crop at all, had to make an advance of 1s. per seer, or at the rate of 10s. 6d. per acre, to the cultivator. While it was confessed that in many places the production of the poppy was an advantage to the cultivator, yet there was perfectly clear evidence to show that in other places the crop was being rapidly superseded by crops of other articles far more beneficial to humanity; and he could not help thinking that if the Government of India would turn their attention less to the production of opium and more to that of other crops, it would be to the benefit of the cultivator and mankind at large. The next point was the argument that the cultivation of the poppy was required by the Native States. Now the number of chests from those States had gradually fallen away since 1886. In 1886-7 the number of chests on which duty was paid was 39,745, and in 1894-5 the figures fell to 27,750. Thus, in spite of all the encouragement that had been given to the Native States, the quantity of opium that passed out of them for duty fell by 33 per cent. Baroda, which used to send 2,000 chests, now sent no opium at all. But granting for a moment that the Native States went on with the cultivation of the poppy, he admitted that the Government was not responsible for the deeds of those States to the same extent as for those of India proper. The Government were able to leave the States to take their own course, but if, by the Government giving up the cultivation, the demand and price of the opium of the Native States were increased they could restrain the increase as at present by raising the transit duties. The Indian Government reduced them from 750 rupees to 600 rupees, and had now again raised the duties to 650, at which figure they could keep them if they desired to wash their hands of the trade. Another argument on this question: what was termed the soldier argument—that opium was essential to the native soldier—altogether failed before the Commission. The evidence showed that there were no fewer than 23 native regiments—16 regiments of the Bengal Infantry, 5 of the Punjab Infantry, and 2 of the Sikh Infantry—which never touch opium at all, and in those in which it was taken the practice was condemned and its effects were shown to be prejudicial both morally and phsically. "'In the 15th Bengal Infantry each man took opium with him according to his requirements; in the 23rd Bengal Infantry three pounds taken up by the Commissariat Department sufficed for two years; in the 32nd Bengal Infantry one pound was taken regimentally, to be issued when ordered, but was brought back unused; and in the 3rd Sikh Infantry a small quantity was taken up by the regimental chowdhri for use if required, but was brought back untouched.' Major-General Sir Robert Low, who held the important military command of the Oudh district, said that the native troops under him were both Hindus and Muhammadans living in the North-West Provinces. In his evidence the opening questions and replies [14,108 to 14,112] ran as follows: 'As a rule are these men opium-eaters?' 'No.' 'I presume there are exceptions in almost every regiment?' 'Yes.' 'What is the highest number of opium-eaters reported in any one regiment under your command?' 'Twenty.' 'And the lowest?' 'Two, that is in the Ghoorka regiment.' 'Is there any regiment in which none are reported?' 'There is one.' General Low said when he was in the 10th Bengal Lancers twelve years ago all the Sikhs took opium habitually in small quantities. The exact amounts he could not remember. Referring to a servant of his who had taken opium for a long time, the General said: 'I did not know that he used it to excess until up in the hills we found ourselves without it. Then he became perfectly useless, and we had to send many miles to get some.' Resaldar Major Nur-ul-Hasan said that in the 6th Bengal Cavalry, in which he had 'served for thirty-six years, about three per cent. used opium.'" It was further proved (Q. 16,952) that of 240 Sikhs in the 10th Bengal Lancers "only eight or nine took it all the year round." Of the 2nd Punjab Infantry, Colonel Turner said that "only two or three per cent. take opium regularly," and the Surgeon in charge said: "He had no doubt that it had a prejudicial effect in cases of pneumonia." Colonel Briscoe, 19th Bengal Lancers, said he gave no numbers because the numbers varied so greatly. "It is also fallacious," he said, "to take a percentage of Sikhs, because it is very unusual for a young Sikh to take opium at all. The habit is chiefly amongst middle-aged and old men." This evidence was confirmed by most of the witnesses. The last of the Sikh regiments enquired into at Delhi was the 29th Punjab Infantry. Lieut.-Colonel Reid said the general tone of the regiment "is against its use;" that "the habitual opium-eater's appearance was against him, for he seemed to have deteriorated physically." The Colonel said further in his evidence: "'Nine men, that is one per cent. of the regiment, habitually eat opium . . . . of whom three men, or one-third per cent. of the regiment, eat in excess; and six men, or two-thirds per cent., eat in moderation.' 'Morally the results are bad. The habitual opium-eaters are marked men in the regiment, and are not trusted like the rest. I would not enlist an opium-eater if I knew it.' Only one commanding officer of Rajputs appears to have given evidence, viz., Colonel Jamieson, 7th Bengal Infantry. He stated that in his regiment twelve men used opium in moderation and one in excess. The general evidence from the Sikh States show that taking opium before forty is considered objectionable, and a species of licentiousness." Then, with regard to China and the practice of opium-smoking in that country, Consul Allan, Chefoo, had said (vol. v.): "I expect that the civil and military officials would indignantly deny that men under their orders smoked opium. In fact, the Brigadier-General in charge of the troops told me that he dismissed at once any soldier caught smoking opium." In the same volume, Consul Bullock, of New Chang, said: "Ask a Chinese which would win in a fight, a regiment of men allowed to smoke opium or one of similar men who were prevented from doing so, and he will laugh at the simplicity of the question. . . . . Opium-smoking is condemned in Chinese opinion as degrading, because injurious. The public voice cries out against it as a great evil to the nation." Again, Consul Hurst, of Tainan (p. 323), declared: "As long as China remains a nation of opium-smokers there is not the least reason to fear that she will become a military power of any importance, as the habit saps the energies and vitality of the nation." Therefore, so far as malarial disease was concerned, so far as the native soldier, the cultivator, and the Native States were concerned, it was shown by the evidence that there was no force in the argument that the cultivation of the drug was essential to or required by any of them. He now came to what was perhaps, after all, the crucial part of the position he took, and that was opium-smoking. He had never, in any speech he had made on the question, and he was not aware that any of his hon. friends had done so, gone deeply into the habits of taking opium pills or small quantities of the drug. What he and his friends had always gone steadily against was the trade in opium for smoking and the practice of opium-smoking in China, the Straits Settlements, and in India itself. On this point he was at one with the Commissioners, for he was glad to say they all went straight against opium-smoking in India. In paragraph 80 of the Report the Commissioners said: "On the other hand, it was clearly shown before us that native public opinion generally condemns the habit as disreputable, mainly, perhaps, from its associations, and this opinion is shared by the great mass of European witnesses, official and private, including the medical practitioners." Again, on page 118, the Medical report says: "The practice of opium-smoking is generally looked down upon in India as a low and vicious habit. Several of the witnesses thought the practice—and especially that of madak smoking—injurious to health. Others thought that the injurious effects were not due directly to the smoking, but were due to the associations and surroundings of the habit. These are certainly very bad. The practice of smoking seems to require that it shall be carried on in company, and the premises or 'dens' in which opium-smokers meet in India are of a squalid and insanitary character." This view was confirmed in the memorandum of Mr. Haridas Veharidas, one of the native members of the Commission, which was attached to the Report. He said: "The practice of opium-smoking is generally condemned, but nothing short of its abolition by law will, in my humble opinion, put an end to it. It is most desirable that it should be made penal. . . . . A strict law should be made prohibiting opium-smoking in any form and under any circumstances." The Máhárája Bahadur of Darbhanga stated in a note supplementary to the Report that while he thought it was impossible to make any suggestions that could apply to the whole of India, and therefore hesitated to lay down any hard-and-fast line, yet "he would urge that opium should be sold in bottles or phials labelled 'poison,' and the minimum dose which was likely to be fatal should also be legibly printed in the vernacular on these labels. . . . . The habit of opium-smoking is generally looked upon as a degrading habit. Mr. Haridas Veharidas has entered into the subject very fully; and I find myself in agreement with his views on the subject." Other native gentlemen in various parts of India took a similar view. Further, among English officials who gave evidence, Mr. H. E. M. James, "of the Northern Division, B.B.," said: "In India it is a degrading vice, the mark of a debauchee, and 99 out of 100 who practise it are degraded and worthless, perhaps criminal, persons." Mr. J. M. Campbell, Bombay, said: "Though the description under review may be overdrawn and misleading, the practice of opium smoking is evil and wasteful. It would be well if it did not exist." The collector at Satara said: "The vice of opium smoking evidently possesses a fearful fascination when once it is acquired, and its effects are deadly, depriving the victim of all moral resolution. With these facts made palpable, it is a serious thing for Government to offer any facility for acquiring the vice by licensing a shop, where anyone is at liberty to make a trial." To the same effect he might quote many other witnesses. Now as to the prevention of the evil, the Commissioners stated that though they were unable to recommend the adoption of measures of restrictive legislation, yet they did recommend that the licensing of shops in the provinces for the manufacture and sale of opium should be abandoned. On page 72 of the Report the Commissioners said: "While we are not prepared to recommend measures of restrictive legislation, we are in favour of making it difficult for smokers of *Chandu* and *Madak* to indulge in the habit. We recommend that the Government should abandon in all provinces the licensing of shops for the manufacture and sale of these preparations, showing thereby that they are in sympathy with public opinion. In the Punjab, Bombay, North-Western Provinces, and Oudh, this has already been done, and in those provinces, individuals, though they may manufacture the preparations for their own use, are not permitted to possess a larger amount than 180 grains weight. We recommend that these provisions be extended to the other provinces of British India. The manufacture of small quantities by private persons is wasteful, and the process tedious. Only confirmed smokers therefore are likely to incur the expense and trouble. The general adoption of this system, which is undoubtedly repressive, so far as it can be enforced will tend to prevent the spread of the habit, and lead, it may be hoped, to its ultimate extinction." The Commissioners came up to his standard in dealing with the question so far as opium smoking in India was concerned, whether they took the recommendation of the English gentleman and Indian officials who proposed to take away the licences of shops for the manufacture and sale of opium, or whether they adopted the advice of the two native Indian gentlemen on the Commission, who knew the country intimately, and who suggested that opium smoking should be put down by law. The trade in opium was falling away. The revenue from it in 1880-81 was Rx. 8,451,382, and in 1894-95 it had fallen to Rx. 4,138,300. He had proved that as a febrifuge and prophylactic, opium was not wanted, that the cultivator could do without it, that we could arrange with the Native States, that the native soldiers were better without it, that opium-smoking was condemned in India as a low and vicious habit, and he would also prove that in China it was undermining society, while from its effects the people were surely deteriorating. Mr. E. Starkey, who had been for 27 years a merchant in China, said: "There are many smokers in moderation, but usually after ten years or so of indulgence they suffer in health and require increased doses. The opium habit is undermining society in this province (Chinkiang); the moral standard of non-smokers is affected by it, and the people are surely deteriorating." This gentleman was formerly an importer of opium. Our Vice-Consul at Canton, Mr. Bourne, said: It is correct to say that there can be no moderation: excessive habit is condemned as degrading and injurious, but the moderate habit only as likely to lead to excess." Mr. Williamson, Acting Vice-Consul in Corea, quoted Dr. Landes as saying: "It ruins morally and physically at least 90 per cent. of the Koreans who use it." Mr. Frank Trench, of Chung-king, in China, said: "Opium smoking is an unmitigated evil. It has enormously added to the sin and misery of this country. It weakens every physical power before long, and makes wreck of the man or woman eventually for certain. Sir George Staunton, who was the representative of the East India Company at Canton, said, many years ago: "It is mere trifling to place the abuse of opium on the same level with the abuse of spirituous liquors. It is (*i.e.*, the abuse) the main purpose in the former case; but in the latter it is only the exception." Miss Geraldine Guinness, who wrote "Four Years' Sojourn in China," had travelled through six of its provinces, and was also personally acquainted with the opium question in Tonquin, the Straits Settlements, Colombo and Aden. She gave a graphic account of some of her opium experiences in China. She spoke of how her heart ached and bled during the painful hours in which she had worked by the bedside of women and girls who had poisoned themselves by opium to save themselves from fates worse than death, to which they had been sold because their fathers and husbands wanted opium. "The opium vice," she said, "are not one crime simply, but a concentration of all crimes." She spoke of the great opium palaces of lust in Shanghai that she had visited, where hundreds of women were held in bitter bondage. "Crimes of the blackest dye," she affirmed, "are directly traceable to opium in China." Archdeacon Wolfe, in 1888, wrote: "The devil could not have invented a more pernicious vice for the destruction of soul and body than this of opium-smoking, and woe to the man who by word or deed gives any support or encouragement to the hell-born traffic! Men openly and without shame prostitute their wives, in order to procure for themselves the means of indulging in opium-smoking. Little children are sold as slaves and turned away from the embrace of their helpless mothers in order that their degraded fathers may have money to buy opium. All this and much more may be told of the effects of opium-smoking on the miserable people; yet professing Christians in England see no harm in it, and openly advocate the abominable traffic, which makes it possible and comparatively easy for the Chinese people to ruin themselves and their wives and children for time and for eternity!" There were varying estimates of the proportions of opium smokers who suffered more or less injury from the habit. The medical missionaries said 71 per cent.; other missionaries, 74 per cent.; medical officials, 55 per cent.; sundry medical men, 61 per cent.; consuls, 58 per cent.; other officials, 40 per cent.; one merchant, 80 per cent.; and the Sassoons, who were importers, 10 per cent. An LL.D. of Oxford, who was now in the pay of the Chinese Government, in sending a contribution to the Anti-Opium Society, wrote: "Having lived among the Chinese for 34 years, and seen the disastrous results of the fast-increasing consumption of opium, it has long been my wish to aid in any reasonable scheme that may be started to remove this enormous evil which has undermined and almost destroyed the very life and strength of the nation. Japan, with her total exemption from the use of the drug, is proving more than a match for China, now almost overpowered by it. I fear that China has to go through a dreadful course of humiliation and suffering before she can be driven to free herself from the baneful effects of opium by using the strong and drastic remedies that are now necessary. Japan is a most dangerous enemy, but even if China can withstand a Japanese invasion she can never survive unless this soul and body destroying poison is completely exterminated." He had proved that a large portion of the revenue derived from the sale of opium to our soldiers deteriorated them and was immoral in its character. Certainly that derived from the sale of opium for the drugging of infants was immoral, and as certainly that derived from facilitating suicide and murder. No fewer than 53 witnesses admitted that opium was continually used in the promotion of sensuality. A gentleman living in Singapore who had studied the question carefully, said: "The more I investigate the subject the more plain and clear is the ultimate connexion between opium and sensual vice." Surely this was an immoral revenue. In India, smoking was condemned on all hands—by our own Commission, by the native Commissioners especially, and by our intelligent officials. All called out for the abolition of the habit and the destruction of this portion of our immoral revenue. When we turned to our customer China, the evidence was stronger still that our opium and her own were causing her destruction as a nation. Ninety per cent. of our revenue came from China, and we were ruining China by making her participate in the trade. We could not get over the fact that, although China might supply herself, and did supply herself, we were participators in that which was immoral; and this was the ground on which he asked the House to vote for the Resolution. The argument that if we were not to supply China with opium, China would supply herself is one which was very well met in John Dymond's "Essays on Morality." He said: "I have no right to do that which is wrong, if it is wrong, because somebody else is going to do wrong. If I were to sell a man arsenic, or a pistol, knowing that the buyer wanted to commit murder, should I not be a bad man? If I let a house knowing that the renter wanted it for purposes of wickedness, am I an innocent man? Upon such reasoning you might rob a traveller on the road if you knew that at the next turning a footpad was waiting to plunder him. To sell property or goods for bad purposes, because if you do not do it some one else will, is like a man selling his slaves because he thought it criminal to keep them in bondage." This was their position: it was not that we supplied the whole of China, but that we supplied China with that which was immoral in its character and consequences, and was deteriorating to China. The hon. member for Central Finsbury (Mr. Naoroji) purposed to make an addition to the Resolution; and that Amendment expressed views which he held; but he had not touched upon the question of finance, which was referred to a Commission. There were many who believed that our Frontier Policy in India was a policy which was of an expensive and unknown character, and required placing on a more permanent basis. Since the Afghan war we had had 10,000 more English troops and 20,000 more native troops in India. Whether we required them or not, Parliament had not the means of knowing: but the cost of them was largely eating up the increase in the revenue of India. In 1891 Mr. Smith declared, as Leader of the House and of the Government, that the policy of the Government was to diminish the area of poppy cultivation and that it would be persevered in in the future. Mr. Gladstone put pressure upon the Government to pursue that policy, and the House carried the Resolution in favour of greatly diminishing the cultivation of the poppy and the production and sale of opium. What was the Government going to do or say now? In 1891 six members of the present Cabinet and 12 of the rank and file of the Government declared their conviction of the immorality of the opium trade; and in 1893 the majority of their supporters voted against the appointment of these Commissions, believing that the House had settled the moral question involved. Were the Government now going to put an end to making opium for smoking in India as recommended by the Commission? Were they going to make smoking penal as proposed by the two Native Commissioners and Mr. Wilson? Were they going to repudiate or to fulfil Mr. Smith's pledges of 1891? Were they going to withdraw or add to Mr. Gladstone's pressure of 1893? Was their policy one of continuing to draw a portion of their revenue from this foul source or would they endeavour to abandon it? He had proved that a great portion of a comparatively small revenue was a revenue immoral in its origin, that the Chinese and Singapore trade was an immoral trade, and that we were making profit by debasing our neighbours. Some of them had laboured hard believing that the good name of this country was at stake. Opium might be capable of being used in old age or for medical purposes with advantage; but the trade in it was an immoral trade. The Christian Churches said so, political economy said so, morality and ethics said so; and all these forces would ultimately unite to say that the country should not carry on a trade which was so debasing and demoralising in its character. He concluded by moving the Amendment.

Mr. JOHN ELLIS, in seconding the amendment, said that he proposed to confine his remarks to the attitude of the authorities in India with respect to this Commission and to the procedure of the Commission itself. On November 20, 1893, two days after the Commission met, there was laid before it a very important document—a letter from the Governor-General of India—and it was not to be found anywhere in the report of the Commission's proceedings. As that contained a statement in support of the existing system, and a warning as to the serious political consequences that might ensue from interfering with it, it looked like an attempt to influence unduly the course of the enquiry. It was an extraordinary proceeding on the part of the Governor-General. It would not be tolerated on the part of a high political executive officer in this country, and he would not dream of it. He hoped his right hon. friend the Secretary for India would give his opinion as to that letter and produce the document, which came from the Governor-General, was laid before the Committee at almost its earliest stage, and was intended to influence its proceedings. Hon. members who studied the seven volumes of the proceedings of the Commission carefully would find here and there not very carefully arranged—nothing was carefully arranged in those volumes—communications from the Central Government to the subordinate governments in Madras, Bengal, Central India, North-West Provinces, and the Resident of Haidarabad, giving instructions as to the manner in which evidence was to be collected, and indicating the kind of evidence, and requiring that lists of witnesses, with their evidence, should be sent to the Central Government. That was a proceeding not calculated in any respect to aid the Commission in finding out the truth. This want of trust in subordinate governments was very much misplaced under the circumstances. Their excise regulations and other characteristics being different, they ought to have been left to take their own course in relation to the Royal Commission as to witnesses and their evidence. What was the course likely to be pursued, following on this, by the subordinate government? Precisely what he believed was followed by the Government of the North-West Provinces. They issued instructions that none of their officials should communicate direct with the Secretary of the Royal Commission. He wondered what would be thought if, when a Commission or a Select Committee was appointed in this country, executive officers were found interposing to prevent any of their subordinates dealing direct with the Secretary of the Commission or the Clerk of the Committee. What had been the action of the authorities with respect to the collection of evidence and towards witnesses? But before he dealt with that he should like to point out that there was one great omission with respect to this matter. The hon. baronet who moved this motion had alluded to the soldier argument. They often heard that the Rajputs and regiments drawn from certain parts of the country could not live without opium; that it was their daily stimulant and they must have it. A circular was issued to the officers commanding every regiment and battalion in the native army asking them for numerical returns as to the numbers of opium smokers, etc. But he had looked in the Blue Books in vain for any of these figures. Where were the replies to these circulars? Parliament should have been furnished with them, whether they upheld the action of the authorities on the opium traffic or were against it. Then when the House came to the issue of circulars to persons who desired to give evidence there were strong illustrations of what he would almost venture to call the perversion of terms of reference to the Commission. All would agree that when a document was quoted it should be quoted accurately, and if it was said that the Government had resolved on a certain policy the exact words should be given in which that policy was laid down. He had great complaint with respect to this. One official of the Indian Government—Mr. Lyall by name—issued a circular, and by no means in that circular quoted the terms of the resolution of the House of Commons appointing that Commission accurately or textually. It was quite true that two days afterwards corrected copies were sent out. Whether Mr. Lyall's attention had been called to it or not he did not know, but in his first circular the terms of the reference were misquoted and the circular was misleading. Let him now turn to the witnesses. A certain medical practitioner, Isau Chandra Roy, M.B., received a circular desiring him to give evidence on certain points. Surely when evidence was asked for, it was not usual to prescribe in the first instance to a person the points on which it was desired he should give evidence. He was usually asked the points on which he desired to give evidence, and then it was seen whether or not they fell within the terms of the reference. On 4th December a letter was sent to this gentlemen, who sent in evidence unfavourable to the existing system. A date was fixed for his examination, and on 3rd January the officer who asked him to give evidence and suggested points on which he should give it, wrote to him that: "Under instructions received from the Government you are not required to attend to give evidence before the Royal Commission on Opium." The same treatment was meted out to others whose evidence was not favourable to the Central Government. Mr. Roy attended on the Commission after he had been told he need not, and stated that not only had he received that treatment, but others had been treated in the same way. The evidence of Rai Bahadur Jai Prakishlal, C.I.E., a chief officer and gentleman of high position, was not favourable to the Government, and though present at the Commission he was not called as a witness. The list of witnesses at Lucknow contained a large number of names of persons who were not called. There were twenty-four called, twenty-three were called for, but were not produced, and seventeen were rejected. Among those not called were a large number who were opposed to the cultivation of poppies, and it turned out that two of them were actually officers of the Indian Government, who were prepared to say that the suppression of that cultivation would have no injurious effect either upon the revenue or rents. The most striking illustration of the way in which the case was worked up and engineered by the Indian authorities was afforded by the fact that on the 9th September the Government of India directed the Agent-General of Rajputana to give instructions for the appointment of witnesses and the nomination of a representative European officer, and that an abstract of the evidence should be lent to the Central Government. Upon the 22nd September Colonel Trevor, the Agent-General, issued a circular to all political officers in Rajputana, and on 13th of October Colonel Abbott was appointed to give evidence and to produce witnesses. The circular that Colonel Abbott drew up was of a most extraordinary character. It filled two or three pages of the Blue Book, and certainly he had never seen before such leading questions as it contained, which showed a surprising want of fairness of mind and of judicial temper on the part of those who were supposed to be impartial in getting up evidence to be laid before a Commission. It should have been the duty of the Indian Government to take care that the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, should be laid before the Commission, but instead of that, the manner in which the questions to the witnesses were framed was such as to suggest the answers that it was desired should be given. The witnesses were assembled a week beforehand, in order that Colonel Abbott might have interviews with all of them before they were examined. Apparently the evidence so obtained did not satisfy the Government, because after they received the report of Colonel Abbott as to what he had done, Mr. Bayley, Assistant Agent to the Governor-General, wrote a long letter on the 29th September, in which he pointed out that on looking over what Colonel Abbott had stated, he was afraid that the subject of the loss that the revenue would sustain by the suppression of the cultivation of poppies had not been put forward with sufficient clearness, and directed Colonel Abbott to take further steps in order that the Commission might be fully informed upon that head. Speaking on his responsibility as a member of Parliament, he could say he had given the House only a slight and fragmentary illustration of what he could lay before them under this head of witnesses and evidence. The whole thing was the most complete inversion of the ordinary rule to which we were accustomed in this country when it was desired to elicit the truth upon any question. It was clear that in this case the Central Government of India had suggested the kind of evidence that should be given, and had taken care that the Commission should have not the whole truth, but only a part of it laid before them. The result of all this it was easy to foresee. He did not think that anyone could sum up the case more clearly than had been done by one of the witnesses, who, after giving his opinion on the matter, added: "That is the general opinion, but whatever the Government thinks is right." Nothing could bring home to the English people more clearly the character of the evidence that had been given before the Commission than those words, and nothing more contradictory to our English ideas of getting at the truth than the course that had been adopted by the Indian Government in this matter could be conceived. Hon. members would not have been addressing that House that night on that subject if the people of this country thought that whatever the Government thought was right. He protested against the idea that had got into the minds of these poor people that they were bound to think as the Government did upon this subject. He should like to conclude his portion of this aspect of the matter by alluding to the behaviour of the authorities to the Royal Commissioners. At Bankipur, on 3rd January, 1894, the hon. member for Holmfirth laid before the Commission particulars of the police of the district of Gya having been round enquiring of the people into his (Mr. Wilson's) movements, whom he had seen, and what had been said by and to him by the inhabitants, etc. On the 4th January, 1894, Mr. Macpherson, collector of revenue at Calcutta, said: "I had heard in Calcutta from Mr. Dane that anti-opium people had been over our district hunting up evidence they seemed to think of importance." He had, therefore, spoken to the local superintendent of police, who had set his men to work. Those who were engaged in endeavouring to elicit the truth on this question ought not to have been pressed by the police in this way or spoken of in this manner, nor should Mr. Harris, the superintendent of police, and his myrmidons have been permitted to track out the movements of the hon. gentleman and his friends, who were engaged in the work. They could not expect fair evidence to be given to the Commission if the police were set to work like that. Turning to the second part of his subject, the procedure of the Commission itself, his hon. friend (the mover) had dwelt upon the fact that the two secretaries were Indian officials. He did not suppose they would have any contradiction from the other side of the House with regard to that, as they had in regard to another matter. Mr. Hewett and Mr. Baines represented that enormous despotic bureaucracy which governed, and, to his thinking, on the whole so well the Indian Empire. He endorsed what had been said by his hon. friend that this Commission ought to have been supplied with a secretary from among the many competent men to be found in London who was not imbued with the traditions of the Indian Government, and who was acquainted with English standards of justice and fairplay. Such a man would have taken care that the Commission should be treated with respect, and that the witnesses should be summoned and dealt with in a fair way. Then there was the special agent, Mr. Dane, who was one of those who committed himself very strongly in 1890 to an opinion on this opium question. He (Mr. Ellis) endorsed what his hon. friend had said with regard to the questioning of certain members of the Commission. Sir James Lyall, undoubtedly, had been in the service of the Indian Government, and there was no question as to the position of Mr. Fanshawe, who was a Postmaster-General in the Indian service. He had read with a feeling of almost shame and indignation the manner in which these two gentlemen had thought fit to examine witnesses. They had asked them with regard to their private affairs and their income; persons of the humblest class were asked questions of a character which one would expect only from an Old Bailey practitioner. The majority of that House who voted for the Commission—he himself voted against it—would certainly not have had our fellow-subjects in India treated as some of them had been by some of the members of the Royal Commission. He ventured to say that any hon. gentleman filling the position of chairman of a Select Committee of that House would have at once called any of his colleagues to order who so treated witnesses coming before the Committee. The humbler the position of the witness, and the more nervous he was, the more kindly should be his treatment, and the more also should the chairman and the members endeavour to set him at his ease. One of the witnesses seemed to have been asked with reference to his pay. The witness did not know if it would affect the character of his evidence, but said of course he had no objection to say if the question was pressed. Mr. Fanshawe at once said: "I must press the question." He wished to pay his tribute of respect to his hon. friend the member for the Prestwich Division of Lancashire, who conducted his examination in a very different way; and who, when a witness demurred to answering questions of rather a private nature, said that certainly he would not press them. There was the greatest contrast between the conduct of the hon. member for the Prestwich Division of Lancashire and that of Sir James Lyall and Mr. Fanshawe in this respect. Passing from that he called attention to the very different treatment which was accorded to the memorials of various bodies, and pointed out that while all the pro-opium memorials were allowed to go into the appendices without a word of comment, an official, charged with the collection of evidence, was set to work by the Indian Government to tear to pieces the anti-opium memorial, especially one from Calcutta. Surely this Commission ought to have been above that sort of thing. With regard to evidence as to our opium policy with China, the Chairman of the Commission, Lord Brassey, actually stopped two witnesses of great competency from giving evidence as to this, and said: "We may take it that we all regret that policy of the past, that we accept the statement that was made on behalf of the late Government by Sir James Fergusson that such a course of policy as that would never be permitted again; that, I think, is agreed." Would it be believed, however, that after this the Commission allowed 150 pages of the most controversial matter upon this opium policy with China to appear in their Report? If Mr. Dane, who wrote this, had been examined before a Committee of that House, half his statements would have been made mincemeat of. It would not have been allowed by a single Private Bill Committee upstairs. These 150 pages were saturated with misstatements and inaccurate particulars, and altogether it was not worth the paper on which it was written, and he deprecated even the cost of printing such a document, which had not formed the subject of any cross-examination. Then in the Majority Report he regretted to say there were the most misleading quotations which it had ever been his lot to see in any public document. There were two missionaries named Ashmore and Bones, and in the case of Mr. Ashmore the statement put into his mouth by the majority in their Report was not borne out in the least degree by his evidence. In the case of Mr. Bones something worse had been done. They pretended to give his words, but they absolutely left out two or three sentences which had a vital bearing on the issue without any indication of the omission. He never saw such a specimen of misleading quotation. Such things deprived the Report of the Commission of any real value. Then there was a table given on page 12 of volume 6 of the Report of certain figures in which a large number of years were left out. The whole argument based on these figures disappeared when they supplied the figures which were left out. He could fill pages of the *Times* newspaper with the inaccuracies contained in the Report; the time they had had to examine into the matter had been all too short. Turning to the unauthorised papers appended to the Report, he said he had inquired as to how these precious documents came to be there. He had had a correspondence with Lord Brassey, who informed him that no request was made to either Mr. Dane or Mr. Baines to write these papers, but when they appeared it was thought desirable to put them in. He (Mr. Ellis) believed their insertion was never brought before the Commission at all. There was a Supplemental Historical Note by Mr. Dane occupying 35 pages, an account of the recent action of the Government of India with regard to poppy cultivation, and a history of the movement in England against opium. They might as well ask the Secretary of the Licensed Victualler Association to write a history of the temperance movement. He would now come to the last feature in the proceedings of the Commission. The Royal Commission, on the last page of their Report, referred to his hon. friend the member for the Holmfirth Division. They say: "We desire to make a special reference to the Report which we understood to be in preparation by our colleague, Mr. Wilson. The criticism or suggestions which it may contain have not been submitted for our consideration. We regret that in the discussion which took place during the preparation of our Report we were not placed in possession of the views of our colleague." Why not? What right had the Commissioners to use that language? Lord Brassey, the Chairman of the Commission, wrote two letters to his hon. friend on the 2nd and 7th of January of this year, enclosing a copy of a letter that he addressed to Sir James Lyall. Lord Brassey told his hon. friend that it would be unprofitable to enter into a prolonged discussion, and that he did not anticipate that their further deliberations round the Table would occupy many days. In his letter to Sir James Lyall Lord Brassey said: "I strongly insist that the completion of our work has become of extreme urgency, and having received two communications within the last few days, I feel my duty calls for some decided course of action. . . . . I shall in any case relieve the Commission from further collecting work on the 26th." That was a proceeding for a Chairman! Giving notice that in three weeks' time the closure would be applied! Having thus closed the mouth of his hon. friend, the Commissioners thought fit to reproach him for not having his assistance in discussing the Report. His hon. friend would have been extremely ill-advised if, after receiving the Chairman's letter, he had in any way obtruded his advice on the Commission. It was not a case of closure by compartments: it was the guillotine all at once. That method of conducting a Royal Commission was, he believed, unprecedented. He did not wonder that there was some little impatience on the part of the Secretary of State for India, for the Commission had been dragging on for three months in India and twelve months in this country, and during that time the Chairman of the Commission did not think it inconsistent with his duty to be out of the country a good many months. There was at the time no effort being made to prepare a Report or to bring the enquiry within reasonable distance of a conclusion. He must say one or two words on the action of the Secretary. Mr. Baines had in two particulars shown that he was utterly wanting in the discretion necessary in an office of that kind. In the first place, he deliberately, and of his own motion, suppressed a note which the hon. member for the Holmfirth division desired him to insert if certain correspondence was put in. In the next place there was the conduct of the Secretary in prematurely disclosing the Report of the Commission. It was a most extraordinary thing that an officer of the Indian Government should have disclosed this Report on Saturday the 20th April to a particular newspaper, and that one a powerful friend of the existing system. It appeared in that newspaper on the 22nd, and it was not in the hands of members till May 7th. The Secretary of State said he had reasons to believe that the Report would be laid on the Table on the 22nd, but if it had there was no reason why it should have been given out to a particular paper on the 20th. He said that on both these two aspects of the question—on the conduct of the authorities and the procedure of the Commission—the illustrations he had given, and which could be supplemented by the score, had gone far to vitiate and weaken the claim of the Report of this Commission to their respect. From the first letter of the Viceroy, that most extraordinary document, which was laid before the Commission on the 20th November, down to the closuring of the hon. member for the Holmfirth division, and the other incident he had mentioned, there was one persistent intention on the part of the authorities of India to regard this, not as a free enquiry, but as a defence of the Indian opium policy of the Government. He acquitted the Government as a whole, and particularly the right hon. gentleman the Secretary of State for India, from the slightest complicity in, or approval of, the proceedings. He was quite aware they could not have this kind of procedure in this country. The procedure adopted was one ill-becoming the reputation and the dignity of a Royal Commission. A Royal Commission had great functions and powers, and it ought to pursue an even tenour. It ought, on the one hand, to resist, as the judicial bench would resist, all pressure of the Executive Government, and on the other hand ought not to listen to words of untruth, but freely admit all evidence, without fear or favour, and without a partial hand: whilst, above all, it should be guiltless of any suppressions of testimony. This movement, however, depended, not upon Royal Commissions and their Reports. Those of them who took some part in trying to get off the Statute Book certain Acts of Parliament some years ago, knew they had against them more than one Royal Commission, more than one Select Committee of the House of Commons, with a majority against them, and yet these Acts of Parliament disappeared by almost universal consent in 1886. So it would be in this matter. Those great moral forces on which this movement rested were, to a large extent, independent of their action in this House, even independent of the lives of particular Governments, and he was convinced that they would, in time, sweep away that system which he declared—which six members of the present Cabinet and several other members of the Administration declared in 1891—to be morally indefensible. He begged to second the Resolution.

MR. H. H. FOWLER said: Mr. Speaker, If the Amendment which you have put from the Chair had been one of censure on the recent Royal Commission, of censure upon the individual members, of censure on the mode in which that Commission conducted its proceedings, of censure upon its officers; and calling for the strict action of this House and the Government of India with reference to these officers, I could have understood the present debate. But, Sir, my hon. friends, for whose motives I have the greatest possible respect, must pardon me if I say I can see little or no connexion between the startling Resolution which they ask the House to pass and the unprecedented personal attack they have made upon the gentlemen who have composed that Royal Commission, and upon those who have aided them in carrying out its work. I do not care to waste the time of this House with reference to what I call irrelevant matter, but I have a duty to perform to my absent friend Lord Brassey and to the other members of that Commission, and I have also a duty to perform to those servants of the Indian Government who have no means of defending themselves against the attacks made upon them to-night. (Cheers.) And, Sir, I venture to say the most experienced member of this House, the man who has known most of Royal Commissions, perhaps the man who has sat most frequently upon them, has never heard a Royal Commission attacked in the way and to the extent, and, as I venture to say, so groundlessly as has been this Royal Commission. (Cheers.) I will say a word or two to the House about this Commission. If one knew nothing of what it had done one would suppose this had been an idle, one-sided excursion of pleasure to India. The hon. baronet the member for Barnard Castle Division went so far as to hold up to the ridicule of the House the hospitality which gentlemen residing in India had offered to this Royal Commission, and generally left upon the House the impression that it was a Commission which had done no work, that it was entirely in the hands of officials, that it was perfectly one-sided and prejudiced, that its decisions were in no way worthy of respect. I ask the House to remember the date of this attack. My hon. friend said that perhaps it was unfortunate this question should come on on Friday evening. Yes, Sir, and I think it is unfortunate it should come on on Friday evening, the 24th of May. This Commission was passed in accordance with a resolution of this House of June 30th, 1893. The Commission was constituted, and constituted, I believe, with the greatest care, by my noble friend Lord Kimberley, and in communication, as I shall show directly, with some of those gentlemen who have taken a prominent part in censuring the Commission. The Commission was formed on September 2. On September 8 this idle Commission commenced its sittings London. It sat six days in London; it closed its sittings here on the 16th, and then adjourned to meet in Calcutta on November 15. They went to India. They visited Burma, Upper India, Patna, Benares, Lucknow, Umbala, Lahore, Delhi, and Agra. A certain section went to Indore; the other members proceeded to Ahmedabad to pursue their enquiries, and then the whole of them went to Bombay. They sat almost daily during the whole of that winter. The House will have been led to believe that they examined a very small section of packed and selected witnesses. They examined 723 witnesses. They examined every witness offered by the Anti-Opium Society. They put something like 29,000 questions. They sent interrogatories to China, to the Straits, and to Hong Kong. Of course the answers to those interrogatories were not subjected to cross-examination. But they were not placed in the Blue Book as evidence; they were placed there as statements in reply to interrogatories. Well, the Commission then came back to London. They prepared their Report, a document of enormous length. It is quite true that I pressed them for their Report, and the member of this House who urged me most frequently to press them for their Report was my hon. friend the member for the Rushcliffe Division. I did think the delay was too long, and I pressed on Lord Brassey that the Report should be presented in time for the opening of Parliament. That Report was signed on April 16 of this year. It was placed on the Table of the House on April 25, and it became public property on the day it was placed on the Table of the House; it was delivered to members of the House on May 4, and—I call the particular attention of the House to this date—it was sent to India by the mail of May 10; and now, on May 24, not three weeks from the date it was first placed in the hands of members, and while it is absolutely impossible for the Government of India to have read it—and the minority report contains a very serious censure on the Government of India—you are asked to-night to declare that it is a prejudiced document; you are asked to declare that all the Commissioners save one were wrong, that one only was right, and between the hours of 9 and 12 o'clock on a Friday night you are asked to pass this Resolution of censure of the greatest magnitude. I say that such a course is not fair to the Commissioners. I say it is not fair to the people of India; it is not fair to the Government of India; and it is not fair to the members of this House themselves. I ask how many members of this House have read this huge pile of papers—these 2,200 pages? Only two members have read it, and those are, I must presume, the mover and seconder of the Resolution. They are bound to have read every word of the evidence before they brought such charges as they have formulated in this House to-night. No other man has read it. I have not read it. I plead guilty to it. I am responsible for this matter to the House; but I say frankly that, with the enormous amount of Administrative work I have to do at the present moment, and not being quite so strong as I once was, I have found it quite impossible for me to read the evidence and report so as to pronounce an opinion. And yet we are asked to-night, sitting as a final Court of Appeal, to decide a case of this magnitude when there is no man in the House who has gone into the evidence. Now, what was the origin of this Commission? The hon. members told us that they voted against it. But the House, by a majority of 79 declared the Commission should issue. The House was dealing with a grave question in a grave spirit when, on the instigation of my right hon. friend the member for Midlothian, it appointed the Commission. The points referred to the Commission for investigation were these:—"I. Whether the growth of the poppy and the manufacture and sale of opium in British India should be prohibited except for medical purposes, and whether this prohibition could be extended to the Native States. II. The nature of the existing arrangements with the Native States in respect of the transit of opium through British territory: and on what terms, if any, those arrangements could be with justice terminated. III. The effect on the finances of India of the prohibition of the sale and export of opium, taking into consideration (*a*) the compensation payable; (*b*) the cost of the necessary preventive measures; (*c*) the loss of the revenue. IV. Whether any change short of total prohibition should be made in the system at present followed for regulating and restricting the opium traffic, and for raising a revenue therefrom. V. The consumption of opium by the different races and in the different districts in India, and the effect of such consumption on the moral and physical condition of the people. VI. The disposition of the people of India in regard to (*a*) the use of opium for non-medical purposes; and (*b*) their willingness to bear in whole or in part the cost of prohibitive measures." I have seen in an organ of public opinion, which represents the views of my hon. friends, that this Commission was packed by Indian officials. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friends cheer that. There was another criticism of the Commission published in another organ of my hon. friends immediately after the Commission was formed, and written by my hon. friend the member for Bradford (Mr. Caine), who, if he will allow me to say so, is always fair to his opponents and never indulges in personal attack. Let me read what my hon. friend wrote of the Commission in the quarterly organ of the Anti-Opium Society.

Mr. W. S. Caine: It is not the organ of the Anti-Opium Society.

Mr. Fowler: At all events, my hon. friend wrote what I am now about to quote. It is said that the members of the Commission have been selected "with great care and deliberation;" that the president, Lord Brassey, is "a man of wide sympathies," and that both sides in the controversy might repose confidence in "his great impartiality, his sound judgment, and his rectitude." Well, I never heard a public man of impartiality, judgment, and rectitude attacked as Lord Brassey has been attacked to-night. Of the medical member of the Commission, Sir William Roberts, it is said that no better qualified member of the medical profession could be selected.

Mr. Caine: Is there not something more about Sir William Roberts?

Mr. Fowler: Well, that he is of "the old school," and that "his writings show a strong belief in alcohol." Mr. Mowbray, another member of the Commission, is described as the son of one of the most popular members of the House of Commons, and "a young man of great promise in the Conservative party." As to Mr. Haridas Veharidas, the hon. member says he does not know what that gentleman knows about opium, but he knows he will bring to the inquiry great knowledge and experience. My hon. friend then speaks in the highest terms both of the hon. member for Holmfirth and of Mr. Arthur Pease. He then refers to Sir James Lyall and Mr. Fanshawe, and they are the two who formed the official element—two out of nine. And that is a Commission packed with Indian officials. Sir James Lyall's career is one of the many most honourable careers to be found in the Indian Civil Service. He has been there thirty-four years, has risen to a high position in the Indian Civil Service, closing his career with the Lieutenant-Governorship of the Punjab. We are told that because he now receives a pension he is incapable of forming an independent judgment. Will anyone tell the Chancellor of the Exchequer that Sir Algernon West is unable to form a proper judgment upon the question of the English revenue because he has retired on a pension? Mr. James Fanshawe, another of these distinguished servants of the Indian Government, has risen to a high position. Such is the Commission whose conclusions you are to treat with perfect contempt, and whose decisions you are to overrule, simply upon the *ex parte* statements of two honourable and able advocates who opposed the appointment of the Commission, who differ from its conclusions, and who remain perfectly unconvinced, notwithstanding the overwhelming character of the evidence. No; it is too bad to impugn gentlemen like this. The discharge of these public duties involved a great amount of physical and mental labour. It is a thankless duty, but, after all, Englishmen are in the habit of treating public men who do a public duty with the greatest generosity, and with the greatest consideration. When we are told that because they were asked out to dinner they could not deal with this case impartially, I must protest against this mode of dealing with a Commission of this character. There is an end of Royal Commissions, which have hitherto been one of the most powerful and most convenient modes of enquiry, if gentlemen discharging the duties of commissioners are to be treated as these men have been treated. These commissioners arrived at a series of distinct conclusions. We all admit that the report of the Commission conflicts with many preconceived opinions. There is a new light thrown upon the whole of this case by the Report. I am not going to say that my hon. friends are wrong, and the commissioners are right; I will not say the eight are right and the hon. member for Holmfirth is wrong; but questions have been raised affecting the opium consumption, affecting the opinions of medical men, and I maintain that before the House of Commons gives a decision, the question must be argued out. Public opinion must be informed on the question; scientific opinion must be ascertained. My hon. friend quoted the opinion of the Churches. There is a difference of opinion even there. The Church of England and the Church of Rome do not take the same view on this question that the overwhelming bulk of the Nonconformist churches take. This question must be decided not by personal attacks upon the commissioners, but by the weight and value of the evidence. Take Sir William Roberts. He has written a most able memorandum upon this question. That has to stand the test of medical examination in this country, and we cannot take the opinion of any one hon. member as sufficient. The evidence on which Sir William Roberts has founded his statement and which has guided the opinions of the majority of the Commission is now before the medical world, and they will have to deal with it. I have a great many quotations from this Report, but I will abstain from reading them. I shall simply say that there are strong differences of opinion in the missionary view. The Bishop of Calcutta and the Bishop of Lucknow with their clergy addressed two powerful memoranda to the Royal Commission expressing their views that: "while there are evils in the abuse of opium, they are not sufficiently great to justify us in restricting the liberty which all men should be permitted to exercise in these matters, medical testimony seeming to show that opium, used in moderation, is in this country harmless, and under certain conditions of life distinctly beneficial." The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Calcutta said: "It has been urged by some that the use of opium is a serious obstacle to the success of missionary work. Looking back with an experience of more than fifteen years of missionary life, and having consulted priests of longer standing in the country, I have been forced to the conclusion, as far as Catholic missions are concerned, that facts do not tally with this assertion." I do not say that there is not strong evidence on the other side. I admit that there is. But what I am pleading for is the investigation of that evidence, and not a decision hurriedly reached under such excitement as my hon. friend's. If two members of the House cannot agree on a simple statement which is in the Report, how can we accept a statement in the nature of indirect evidence? My hon. friend says that the medical evidence was nearly equally divided. There were 146 medical witnesses examined, and of these only 20 were against the use of opium, and 126 were the other way. (Sir J. PEASE dissented.) My hon. friend says "No." That proves my point, for the House must investigate this thing for itself. We cannot ask the House to come to a grave decision without such independent investigation. The House is the ultimate court of appeal, and its decision must be given on the evidence. If we are going to decide a question affecting the Government of India, its revenue, its administration, and its expenditure, I say that the Government of India have a right to be heard on the question before a decision is arrived at. You would not treat any Parish Council in the manner in which my hon. friend proposes to treat the Government of 300 millions of people. I will leave this question, as Lord Beaconsfield said, "to the instinctive justice of the House," and I am sure that the House of Commons will not decide in such a manner. But I have to deal with the motion which my hon. friend has proposed. He asks us to declare that, after having had presented to it the Report of the Royal Commission, this House is of opinion that the system by which the Indian Opium Revenue is collected is morally indefensible; and to pass a motion calling upon the Government of India to stop the cultivation of the poppy and sale of opium in British India, except to supply the legitimate demand for medical purposes, and at the same time to take measures to arrest the transit of Malwa opium through British territory. What would be the effect on the Indian Government of passing this resolution? I will quote what the late Prime Minister, the right hon. member for Midlothian, said: "The first duty in governing India, before we commit ourselves to a broad declaration, is to learn the mode in which we can carry that declaration into effect. Nothing could be more ruinous, and few things could be more discreditable, than for you to pass a vote which, on the one side, must remain an idle expression of opinion, without practical result, or else, if acted on, must simply have the effect of throwing the finances of India into confusion, and of greatly compromising the position, the welfare, and even the peace and security of that country." Remember it is upon the terms of this motion that the House is going to vote to-night. It is not upon the question whether one witness was fairly cross-examined or not, or whether one police officer was judicious or injudicious. I know the cases to which my hon. friend has referred, and I agree with much of what he said in reference to some of those cases. But as to the question of general unfairness in dealing with witnesses, that was investigated by the Commission; the Commission has given a distinct ruling on the question, and has acquitted the Government of India on every one of the charges brought against it. I am not at this moment arguing the question whether the sale of opium is morally defensible. Remember that it is a revenue arising from restriction and regulation, and a revenue which so affects the price, if opium is a most deadly stimulant, as to make the obtaining of that opium a much more difficult thing than it would otherwise be. The revenue raised from opium in British India is 180 per cent. over the cost price, and the duty raises the price of Malwa opium 118 per cent. There is a long string of findings by the Commission in which they call attention to the various uses for which opium is raised. They admit that there is no doubt the excessive use of opium is a very great evil and a great vice. They point to the fact, which my hon. friend has not discussed, that there is a very large moderate use of opium in India, and so far as medical exception is concerned—my hon. friend makes that exception—they deal with it very clearly. They say in paragraph 177:—"It must be borne in mind that the population of the British provinces is over 220 millions. The number of hospitals and dispensaries under European supervision in those provinces in 1893 was only 1,800, with an average daily attendance of patients numbering 94,000. European non-official practitioners are only found in the Presidency and provincial capitals. The supply of native medical men trained under the European system, though much increased of late years, is still confined to the larger towns or to the district headquarters." Another witness stated that three-fourths of the deaths occur without the invocation of any professional advice of any sort. The Commission go on to show that the idea of medical exception is an absolute impossibility. Where are you to draw the line between medical consumption and general consumption, and who are to be the men who are to lay down the rules to guide this exception? With reference to crime, I do not think my hon. friend stated that crime was in any way promoted in India by the use of this drug. That is something to be said in its favour. With reference to the note of the Mahárájá of Darbhanga, my hon. friend quoted simply his objection to opium smoking. I think, however, he rather left on the House the impression that a member of the Commission was in favour of the general restriction of opium. Now, what Darbhanga says in this memorandum just circulated is this:—"To stop the use of opium in cases like these would not only be an unnecessary restriction on the freedom of the subject, but it would also lead to the increased consumption of alcohol." And this view is expressed by a large number of witnesses. My hon. friend says that it is morally indefensible to raise revenue from a stimulant the excessive use of which produces the terrible results which in his view flow from opium. I would like to know what my hon. friend's answer would be to a very keen logical Hindoo who asked him and us whether when we proposed to deprive the Indian Government of their opium revenue we were prepared to adopt the same rules for ourselves. My hon. friend the member for Bradford says "Certainly"; but I do not hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer say "Certainly." The imaginary opponent of my hon. friend on this ground of moral indefensiblity might say to him, "I hear from statements in your Legislature, from the statements of your judges, medical men, and philanthropists, that crime, lunacy, pauperism, disease, the desolated homes, and the ruined lives in your country are all owing to the results of the excessive use of other stimulants, which excessive use one of your greatest Prime Ministers declared, amid the cheers of the House of Commons, inflicted on the nation more terrible evils than war, pestilence, and famine combined. Is it true, when you say it is morally indefensible to raise money from the restriction and regulation of the sale of opium in India, that you are rising between £30,000,000 and £40,000,000 a year revenue from a similar source?" (A voice: "Shameful.") "Shameful," says my hon. friend. Well, then, stop it here first. Go to India with clean hands. You, the wealthy country with your £30,000,000 to £40,000,000 from the Drink Duty—deal with that before you ask India to plunge itself into financial embarrassment on account of the excessive use of a drug which not one of the witnesses before this Commission, no matter how strong his opinions, declared produced anything like the results which the excessive use of alcohol produce in this country. My hon. friend proposes to stop the growth of the poppy. How is it to be done? It is easy to pass a resolution of the House of Commons; but the references show that the average area under poppy is held by 1¼ million of cultivators under the licensing system, with an enormous proportion below a third of an acre. In the event of Prohibition, all this must come under inspection. I ask the House of Commons to conceive the stopping of the cultivation, carried on by a million or a million and a-half of people, of this plant, which has been grown by them for centuries, which is a chief source from which these poor peasants derive their income and pay their rent. Where is the army of inspectors to come from? Who is to pay the cost? Where is the limit to be put to the extortion, tyranny, and oppression that would arise from putting down this sort of cultivation? But this is a question which most seriously affects the finances of India. From 1887-8 to 1893-4 the average net revenue arising from it amounted to Rx. 6,965,000; in 1893-4 it was Rx. 5,746,000, and in 1894-5 it was Rx. 6,661,000. If the cultivation is stopped, where is the deficit to come from? The House of Commons is always practical especially in matters of finance. The House of Commons never takes off a tax unless it is certain that there can be a corresponding reduction of expenditure. (Hear, hear, from several Radical members.) My hon. friends say,, "Hear, hear." Where are they going to get this reduction of expenditure?

Mr. Caine: Reduce the Army.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: Apart from exchange, there has been no great increase in the army expenditure in India for a number of years. The Army expenditure, excluding the loss on exchange, was in 1887 19 millions, in 1888 18¾ millions, in 1889 19 millions, in 1890 19½ millions, in 1891 20½ millions, in 1892 20½ millions, and in 1893 considerably under 20 millions. There is, of course, an enormous increase in exchange, for whereas in 1887 the loss on exchange cost the Government of India six millions, this year it is estimated to cost 15 millions. That is where the real increase of expenditure on the army lies. It does not lie in increased military expenditure. We have appointed a Commission to enquire into the military expenditure, but it is nonsense to talk about reducing the military expenditure by five or six millions. There is, however, a still more serious difficulty than the financial difficulty. It is suggested that we should arrest the transit of Malwa opium across British India. Malwa opium is cultivated in the Native States, and passes through our territory to reach the seaside, and we levy on it the enormous duty of Rx. 650 per chest. What would be the effect of stopping that? The effect would be to raise a serious question between ourselves and the Native States. It would mean the stopping of the cultivation of the poppy to the extent of the present export; and it would entail consequent serious injury and loss on the people in those Native States. The average revenue in the Native States derived from opium is 27 per cent. of the whole revenue, and you cannot be prepared to go to the native rulers of those States and say to them: "We will cut off more than a quarter of your revenue at one fell swoop, and will prevent you from sending out of your countries a staple article of your industry." My hon. friend quoted from the representative of one of the little States. Why did he not quote the great ones, who stated that they would regard such a measure as an act of hostility on the part of the British Government? He could not help quoting one of them: "In view of the relations existing between the paramount Power and my State, the former would not be justified in calling upon me to prohibit the cultivation of opium in my State." There is another question to be considered. How are you going to prevent this opium passing the frontier? And, assuming you stop the transit, how are you going to guard the frontier from smuggling? Remember that this opium would be a profitable commodity to get across the frontier. The duty is more than two-thirds of its cost. Some of my friends opposite know a great deal more than I do as to the extent of the frontier line that would have to be guarded, but I am told by experts that it would be at least 5,000 miles. [Sir R. Temple: "Hear, hear!"] Some put it even higher than that. You would have to establish a line of Custom-houses over that great length of territory. We once had a custom line from the Indus to the north border of Madras, 2,500 miles—as long as from Moscow to Gibraltar—and it took 12,000 officers and men to guard that frontier; and when afterwards it was reduced to 1,500 miles it still took 8,000 men to guard it. Therefore, you would have to raise an enormous army of officials to be added to the already too numerous army that exists. And the cost of all this is to be paid by the people of India! I put this to my hon. friend as one of the practical difficulties of the case so far as the Native States are concerned. But there are political consequences also to be considered. Nobody who has any acquaintance with India can be unaware of the fact that there is a disloyal section of people in India—a small section I admit—who are ready to take every opportunity of holding up the British Government and the Indian Government also to the dislike of the people. I am not prepared, as the Minister for India, to do anything which may tend to reinforce that class by the alienation of the Native States. When my hon. friend talks about army expenditure he can hardly realise what the policy he advocates would lead to; for by adopting it we should embark on a course which would make it necessary to increase rather than decrease the army of India. I must apologise to the House for the length of my speech, and I can only plead that I have left out three-fourths of what I meant and desired to say. Now, the Government object to this motion of my hon. friend because it is premature and because it is immature; because it involves a flagrant injustice on the one hand, and because it is impracticable on the other. We are asked as a Parliament to reject the deliberate judgment of a competent Commission appointed by this House, and we are asked to reject that judgment without the slightest opportunity of examining, much less testing, the evidence on which that judgment is founded. We are asked to deprive the Government of India of a large portion of its revenue without making any provision for the inevitable deficit which must follow, and thereby involving one of two things—either disabling the Indian Government from meeting its engagements, or necessitating the imposition of heavy extra taxation. Perhaps the House will allow me to say that all Governments, whether they be despotic or constitutional, have long ago learnt the lesson, and learnt it by bitter experience, that the most arduous, the most difficult task which any Government can undertake is to constantly interfere with the daily habits and daily customs of the masses of the people. This resolution pledges the House to make sweeping changes which would affect the social and the personal life of a very large number of her Majesty's Indian subjects, and you are asked to do this in the teeth of the opinion not only of a majority of the Commission, but in the teeth of the opinion of the two distinguished natives who were put upon the Commission to represent native opinion, and in the teeth of what I do not hesitate to say is the overwhelming preponderance of native opinion. At the same time, while this resolution proposes to destroy the industry, the livelihood, of vast masses of the Indian people, it also menaces our relations with those native States with whom it is our duty and our interest to be on the most friendly terms. The resolution my hon. friend has proposed is not a mere shadowy expression of opinion on some theoretical question with which we may while away a Friday night, and totally outside the range of practical politics, but it sanctions a policy of such magnitude and of such far-reaching extent that the House of Commons must be satisfied upon the clearest evidence—satisfied beyond all doubt that that policy is necessary, is practicable, and is safe, before it attempts to impose it, and impose it by force, on our Indian empire.

Mr. R. G. C. MOWBRAY, as a member of the Commission, ventured to say that anybody who carefully studied the evidence would believe that the Report which they had given was a fair and impartial report, and the only report which they could possibly have published. His hon. friend, the member for the Rushcliffe Division, was exceedingly polite to him personally with regard to his conduct, but he could only say that he did not wish, in the smallest degree, to separate himself from Sir James Lyall or Mr. Fanshawe, and he could not allow the language which had been used with regard to those two gentlemen to go uncontradicted in this House, because he was perfectly certain that not only could they not have got two more able representatives of the Indian officials, but he believed it would be impossible to have got two men who were more generously disposed and more kind-hearted in everything they had to do in connexion with the Commission. The Secretary of State had spoken with regard to Sir J. Lyall, and not more warmly than his public services deserved; but he should like to state that when the Commission were on tour in the Punjab Sir J. Lyall, as an ex-governor, was greeted by all classes of the community in the Punjab, not as an ex-governor, but as a man who had been their personal friend and whom they were delighted to come and welcome. That fact at once demonstrated the kind of man Sir J. Lyall was. Nearly every point which had been raised was brought before the Commission by the hon. member for Holmfirth, and the Commission came to the conclusions upon them embodied in the appendix and also in the Report. The hon. member for the Rushcliffe Division had talked about the attitude of the Government of India towards witnesses, and said that he understood that all the evidence passed through the hands of the Central Government. That did not agree with his own recollection of what happened. There were certain heads of evidence for the presentation of which to the Commission the Government of India held itself responsible, but the rest of the witnesses were selected by the local governments because they were supposed to know best what persons were likely to give good evidence. The Government of India, instructing the local governments as to the selection of the independent and non-official witnesses, said: "It is desirable that they should be gentlemen of some social standing, of independence of character, and of good general intelligence, and so completely in touch with public feeling in their respective provinces as to command the respect and confidence alike of the people of India and of the members of the Commission." The local governments, he believed, did their work honestly in that way, and he also believed that the witnesses who were examined supplied a fair representation of the views of the people of India. He had joined the Commission with a perfectly open mind. It was true that in 1891 he voted against the resolution which was then carried in favour of the abolition of the opium trade, but his chief reason for so voting was that he did not feel disposed to revolutionise the finances of India after a debate lasting three hours only. The evidence laid before the Commission in England, which dealt chiefly with the question as affecting China, was of very much stronger character than anything that they heard in India. Therefore when he landed in India he expected that an infinitely stronger case would be made out against opium in that country than was made out. As witness after witness came before the Commission, it became clearer and clearer to his mind that there was no case whatever against opium in India from a really national point of view. The witnesses on the anti-opium side seemed to him to be the representatives of local and sectiona interests, of temperance and missionary societies, and similar associations. A man would come forward saying that he represented an association, and when he was asked how many members it comprised he would reply 20. Five people came from an association at Lucknow, and it appeared that there were only 175 members in the association out of a population of over 273,000. He had seen it suggested that the evidence had been garbled by the Government of India. On that he would like to say that the Government of India only undertook to suggest witnesses to the Commission at the request of the Commission itself, and they telegraphed to the Secretary of State that they would not be responsible for special searches for anti-opium evidence. Commenting on that, the hon. member opposite said that, as anti-opium evidence was easily available without any special search, the official statement seemed to show that the officials were taking up a partisan attitude. All he could say was, that he condoled with his hon. friend and his associates, because after considerable search very little evidence seemed to be available to them; and, as the Secretary of State had said, in no single case did the Commissioners refuse the evidence of any witness put forward by the Anti-Opium Society. On the other hand they were obliged to put off numberless witnesses on the other side. The Appendices to the Report were full of abstracts of the evidence of witnesses who could not be examined from want of time. The result was that he felt that no numerical comparison between the number of witnesses on one side and the other could be a fair test. The Commission could have had numbers of additional witnesses in favour of opium if they had had more time at their disposal; but on the other hand, and he thought this was a very material fact, not a single witness put forward by his hon. friend opposite and his associates was declined by the Commission. It was impossible to go into details as to these witnesses at that time of the night, though he would be glad to go through them. He would now only ask the House to accept the conclusion at which the Commission had arrived. There might be some slight difference of opinion displayed in some of the details of the reports of their native colleagues, but they were present when the conclusions of the Commission were discussed at Bombay, they joined in those conclusions and signed the Report now before Parliament. He felt it was impossible to detain the House any longer, but he would ask the House to believe this that the Commission had as good an opportunity of getting at the truth of this question as any body of men could have, and he believed they had done the best they could to lay the truth before the people of this country. It would have been a pleasanter and an easier task if they had been able to join with those people who claimed for themselves a monopoly in the cause of righteousness and to have made a milk-and-water report which would have settled nothing; but the Commissioners did not think that if they had done that they would have been doing their duty to the country that sent them out. He certainly did hope, on behalf of the millions of people in India who were consumers of this drug, and still more on behalf of the millions of people who would have to pay additional taxation if this source of revenue were destroyed—he did hope on behalf of the Government and on behalf of the good faith of the English people, that this motion would be rejected.

Mr. H. J. WILSON said the House would recognise at once that it was not possible in the two minutes that remained to say anything material on this subject, but having listened with the utmost attention to the speech of the right hon. gentleman the Secretary of State, he would venture to say that if opportunity offered there was scarcely one of the statements the right hon. gentleman had made that could not be satisfactorily replied to.

Sir R. TEMPLE claimed to move "That the question be now put."

Mr. SPEAKER withheld his assent, and declined then to put that motion.

Mr. H. J. WILSON, continuing, said the one question he would like to put was to ask the right hon. gentleman if he was at least going to carry out the recommendations of the Commission with regard to smoking. The right hon. gentleman had said a good deal about the native members, but was he going to listen in this question to men who knew the feeling of the people of India? If he would not go as far as they and he (Mr. Wilson) desired to go, would he at least listen to the recommendations in the Report of the majority on the question of opium-smoking?

Mr. C. J. Darling claimed to move, "That the question be now put."

The House divided, and the numbers were:

For the Resolution	59
Against..	176
Majority against the Resolution ..	117

May 28th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BRITISH INDIAN SUBJECTS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

Sir Ellis Ashmead Bartlett asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Her Majesty's Government had received a petition from Her Majesty's Indian subjects in the Transvaal, praying for justice and protection;

Whether the Boer Government had claimed and exercised the right of forcibly ejecting British Indian residents in the Transvaal from their homes and businesses, to their serious loss; and what steps Her Majesty's Government proposed to take to protect the rights of Her Majesty's Indian subjects?

Mr. Sydney Buxton: I stated the other day that I was about to lay papers on this subject, which will give in the best form the information required by the hon. gentleman.

May 30th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

BRITISH INDIAN SUBJECTS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

Mr. Arnold Forster asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, when he proposed to lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence and other documents relating to the punishment, without trial, of British Indian subjects resident in the Transvaal?

Mr. Sydney Buxton: I propose shortly to lay the papers relating to the position of British Indian subjects in the South African Republic. They are not yet quite complete. I must, however, demur to the inference put upon the matter in question by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Arnold Forster: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has yet received any information with regard to the case of the Indians in the employment of Messrs. Harvey, stated to have been "cleared out" of the town of Krugersdorp in January last by a Boer field cornet of the name of Rodinstein;

Whether he is aware that the British subjects in question have just received verbal notice to quit;

And whether such notice to quit, served without trial or evidence of an offence committed, is in accordance with Boer law?

Mr. Sydney Buxton: We have now received a dispatch on the subject in reply to our enquiry. The case referred to appears to be that of Ibrahim Mahomed Patel, who attempted to open a store at Krugersdorp. The trader was instructed by the Magistrates to remove his goods—and this he did. The proceedings were, no doubt, taken under a law of the South African Republic of 1885, amended in 1886, in virtue of which the South African Republic claim the right to prohibit Asiatics from trading, except in locations set aside for that special purpose. The hon. member is aware that I am about to lay papers relating to the case of the Indians, and the dispatch just received will be included in the Blue Book.

THE FUTURE OF CHITRAL.

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, before taking action as regards Chitral affairs, Her Majesty's Government would afford the House an opportunity of expressing its views on the subject?

The Chancellor of the Exchequer: Of course the question with reference to Chitral is a very grave one.. The Government are not able at present to make a statement on the subject, but when a policy is decided on the House will certainly be informed of it.

June 11th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE ARMY MEDICAL STAFF.

Mr. Alpheus Morton asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to the condition of the Army Medical Staff in India:

Whether the Medical Department was terribly undermanned:

And whether adequate arrangements were made for a reserve in case of emergencies like the Chitral Expedition.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The establishment of the Army Medical Staff in India is considered sufficient for the requirements of the army in peace and war, and there is no reason to suppose that it is "terribly undermanned" as assumed by my hon. friend.

THE MAHARAJA OF BHARTPUR.

Mr. Seymour Keay asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India had the power to set aside the rulers of Native States in alliance with Her Majesty, without having first obtained the consent of the Home Government, as appeared to have been done in the case of the Máháràja of Bhartpur:

And whether he would lay upon the Table papers relating to the setting aside of this Prince.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: In their dealings with the rulers of Native States, as in other matters, the Government of India use their discretion whether or not to obtain the approval of the Secretary of State in Council before taking action.

It is not for the public interest that the papers relating to the Bhartpur succession should be laid on the Table.

June 13th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

ARMING OF THE KASHMIR CONTINGENT.

Major Rasch asked the Secretary of State for India, when Imperial Service troops, the Kashmir Native Contingent, who were still armed with obsolete Sniders were to receive the the Martini.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: Martini-Henry rifles have been issued to the infantry, which forms the great majority of the Kashmir Imperial service force. I am not able to say at what date they will be issued to the Cavalry, whose numbers are relatively very small.

EXTENSION OF "HER MAJESTY'S INDIAN POSSESSIONS."

Sir William Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India, what extensions had been made of Her Majesty's Indian Possessions subsequent to the passing of the Act for the better government of India (1858):

In what years were such extensions made:

And, what was the name and area of each such extension.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: In 1886 the province of Upper Burma was added to Her Majesty's Indian possessions; its area is about 83,500 square miles. In 1887 the frontier districts of Pishin and Sibi with their dependencies which had been under our administration under the treaty of Gandamak since 1879, were incorporated with British India. Besides these a considerable number of acquisitions of territory, including numerous exchanges with native Princes, have taken place in various ways since 1858, the area in most cases being comparatively small. The information necessary for giving a complete answer to the hon. member's question does not exist in this country.

EXPENSES OF THE SHAHZADA'S VISIT.

Mr. Webb asked the Secretary of State for India, was the United Kingdom or India to bear the expenses incident to the Shahzada's visit to this country.

Mr. H. H. Fowler: The cost of the entertainment of the Shahzada will be defrayed by the Indian Government.

Mr. Hanbury: Will the Indian Government bear the entire cost—every penny of it?

Mr. H. H. Fowler: Yes; but we shall be glad to receive any contribution from the hon. member.

FLOGGING IN THE INDIAN ARMY.

Mr. **HANBURY** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether since the India Office communicated with the Government of India more than 12 months ago on the subject of flogging in the native army of the Crown, any decision had been arrived at with reference to its continuance or abolition:

And, whether he would lay the correspondence upon the Table.

Mr. H. H. **FOWLER**: No decision has yet been arrived at on the subject of flogging in the Native Army in India. Until the correspondence is completed, it cannot be laid upon the Table.

STATEMENT OF MORAL AND MATERIAL PROGRESS.

Copy was presented of the Statement exhibiting the moral and material Progress and Condition of India during 1893-4; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RETURN OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

On the motion of Mr. Fowler, an address was granted for a return of the net income and expenditure of British India, under certain specified heads, for the ten years from 1884-5 to 1893-4.

June 17th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

STATEMENT OF MORAL AND MATERIAL PROGRESS.

The statement exhibiting the moral and material progress and condition of India during the year 1893-4 was presented.

June 18th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE FUTURE OF CHITRAL.

The **MARQUIS of LANSDOWNE**: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary for India a question of which I have given him private notice—namely, whether Her Majesty's Government intend to lay on the Table any papers relating to Chitral, and, if so, what papers, and when.

LORD REAY: Her Majesty's Government are not at present in a position to make any statement on the subject of the noble lord's question or to lay any papers on the Table.

The **MARQUIS of LANSDOWNE**: Is my noble friend able to tell us whether we shall have an opportunity of discussing the question before any final decision is arrived at by Her Majesty's Government?

LORD REAY: I am not prepared to answer my noble friend's question without notice.

The **MARQUIS of LANSDOWNE**: In consequence of the answer I have just received, I beg to give notice that on an early day I shall call attention to the situation in Chitral and ask whether an opportunity will be given to the House to consider any papers there may be on the subject before any decision is arrived at by Her Majesty's Government.

June 20th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON EXPENDITURE.

Mr. **SEYMOUR KEAY** asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he was aware that an intimation had been conveyed to a representative of the Indian Press to the effect that the proceedings of the Royal Commission on Indian Financial Expenditure would be private:

Whether this decision had been arrived at by the Commissioners themselves, or had been imposed upon them by Her Majesty's Government:

Whether he was aware that the principal Indian newspapers had already made arrangements for publishing full reports of the proceedings:

Whether there existed any special reason why the Press should not be admitted, as had been done in the case of the Anglo-Irish Financial Relations Commission, the Welsh Land Commission, the Labour Commission, and the Opium Commission:

And, whether, in view of the great interest taken in India in the proceedings of the Commission on Indian Financial Expenditure, Her Majesty's Government would take steps to secure that the Press should be admitted.

Mr. H. H. **FOWLER**: The question as to the publicity of the proceedings of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure is one for the Commissioners themselves to decide. The Secretary of State is informed that as yet no decision has been arrived at. Any intimation on the subject must, therefore, have been made without authority.

The first meeting of the Commission will be held on the 26th inst.

Extra Supplement to "India" for July.

NOTE No. 2.

INDIAN FINANCE.

Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, 1895-6.

[*In continuation of the Note published in* 1894, *now referred to as Note No.* 1.]

PREPARED BY
THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

1. In the summer of 1894 this Committee drew up a Note on Mr. (now Sir James) Westland's Budget for 1894-5. That Note was submitted to all members of the House of Commons and widely circulated in India. Sir Auckland Colvin, an ex-Finance Minister of the Government of India, in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* for October, 1894, gave it as his opinion "that there are good grounds for the assertion in the recent 'Note' presented to Parliament by Sir William Wedderburn, that it is more the growth of expenditure than the fall in Exchange which has led to the present difficulties" (*Nineteenth Century* for October, 1894, p. 662). This Note was largely founded on a memorial drawn up by the Bombay Presidency Association and submitted to the Government of India at the time of the Budget debate in the Viceroy's Council at Calcutta in 1894. Two criticisms alone of those passed by Sir J. Westland on the figures thus presented appear to call for comment. One (*a*) relates to the methods pursued in presenting the accounts; the other (*b*) to the dates selected for comparison.

2. As to (*a*) the methods pursued. Speaking in the Viceroy's Council on March the 28th last, and referring to the documents above mentioned, Sir J. Westland said that there was one "gigantic blunder which appeared in the very first page of it." He then continued: "What they wished to prove was that expenditure had increased from other causes than Exchange; what they actually did was to pick out the figures which are placed in the column of Exchange in the Annual Statement of Accounts, and deducting them, to compare the others. . . . . The fall of the rupee, however, directly increases our expenditure under many other items. For example, we are bound to pay to the British soldier his pay in sterling. That expenditure, however, is paid in rupees, and the whole of it is shown in the rupee column and not in the Exchange column at all. Then there is also the Exchange Compensation. . . . . . That expenditure also is one that is shown in the rupee column and not in the Exchange column. . . . . The result is that, if any person desires to prove that the expenditure has risen from other causes than Exchange, he has to allow not only for the figures which are entered in the Exchange column of our estimates, but also for those direct increases due to this cause which are entered in the rupee column." The answer to this criticism, which in itself is a severe if unintentional condemnation of the methods adopted by the Government of India in presenting their accounts, is that the Tables at pp. 6 and 16 of the Note (upon which the conclusions in the Note were principally based) were drawn up by strict adherence to the figures and methods of presentation used by the Government of India in their Financial Statement.

3. As we understand it, the sole object of the column headed "Exchange" in the Accounts of the Government of India is to show exactly the burden placed upon Indian Expenditure which may be properly attributed to the fall in Exchange. If the sterling pay of the British soldier causes an increased rupee expenditure through the fall in Exchange, upon what grounds is this increased expenditure not shown in the Exchange column? Similarly, if Exchange Compensation Allowance is an expense which is entirely due to the fall in Exchange, and varies directly with Exchange, why is not the expenditure in connection therewith shown in the column headed "Exchange"? For it must be remembered that, so far as the Indian taxpayer is concerned, *all* the expenditure of the Government of India has ultimately to be met by rupee payments—the Secretary of State's Bills being merely a convenient medium for paying the rupees in England. It is for Sir J. Westland to explain upon what grounds these two items of expenditure are not shown in the Exchange column.

4. The fact that analytical statements of account prepared with the utmost care from official figures are liable to attack because they have followed too faithfully the Tables submitted to Parliament and the public by the Government of India, is no mean indication of the insufficiency and intricacy of the accounts of the Government of India. When, too, an examination of former financial statements shows that a Finance Minister of India—Sir James Westland himself—prepared and published a table compiled from the Government Accounts which exhibits this same "gigantic blunder," it is clear that the accounts must at any rate lend themselves to variety of treatment, if not to obscurity of interpretation. At p. 8 of the Financial Statement of the Government of India for 1888-9 is a Table which was submitted to the Viceroy's Council by Sir James (then Mr.) Westland, when introducing a Bill to provide for the levy of a customs duty on petroleum. Referring to this Table, he used the following words: "The Abstract I now put forward will be very easily traced back into its component figures in the published accounts; its main peculiarity is that, besides showing the expenditure heads net instead of gross, I have separated the Exchange figures, so that I may show first how the comparison would have stood had there been no alteration in the Exchange, and I have then shown in a separate figure the extra charge falling upon us on this account." In this Abstract the amount due to the loss by Exchange on the sterling pay of the British soldier has been included in the net army expenditure (excluding Exchange), although for the three years shown this amounted, according to a recent Parliamentary Return, to Rx. 46,000, Rx. 184,000, and Rx. 437,000 respectively. Here are the figures as given in Sir J. Westland's Table, and corrected so as to exclude Exchange altogether:—

	Accounts. 1883-4. Rx.	Accounts. 1884-5. Rx.	Budget Estimate 1887-8. Rx.
Net Army Expenditure (*excluding Exchange*) as shown in Sir J. Westland's Table	16,019,000	15,200,000	16,907,000
Deduct:—Rupee Expenditure (due to fall in Exchange on sterling pay of British troops) improperly included in above	46,000	184,000	437,000
Corrected figures (Exchange altogether excluded)	15,973,000	15,016,000	16,470,000

5. As to (*b*) the dates adopted for comparison. In the discussion on the Financial Statement which took place in the Viceroy's Council on the 27th of March, 1894, Sir J. Westland, referring to some recent criticisms on the Budget, made the following remarks: "As regards military expenditure I think there is some misapprehension of the argument I used on 1st March. The increase of military expenditure I admitted, but I pointed out that it had its origin before 1888. My argument was that that increase had been met by the fiscal steps we had recourse to in 1888, and that the new necessities that arose since 1888 were due to Exchange, and Exchange alone." In this present Note it is proposed to meet this criticism, partial as it is, by adopting the accounts for 1888-9 as a starting point and comparing them with the Budget estimate for 1895-6. Even taking the year 1888-9 as the starting point, it will be seen that loss by Exchange is not the sole cause of the existing financial difficulties, but that the increase in Civil and Military Expenditure is the true source of the present embarrassment in Indian Finance.

6. Before proceeding to discuss Sir J. Westland's Budget, it is necessary first to deal with a remarkable Statement of Account which Sir J. Westland had prepared for the Budget debate in the Viceroy's Council. In this statement Sir J. Westland has taken the net income and expenditure for 1883-4 onwards, and converted it from rupees into pounds sterling, with the not unnatural result that as 500 million rupees then were worth far more in English money (*but not in Indian produce*) than even 650 million rupees now, an apparent but utterly illusory decrease in net Indian revenue and expenditure is shown. The fallacy of such a Table is almost too obvious to need exposure were it not that an Indian Finance Minister produces it in all seriousness as a proof, that in spite of additional taxation to meet an increasing expenditure which is outstripping the natural increase in the revenues, the Indian taxpayer is contributing less, and the Indian civil and military services are spending less, than they were only eleven years ago. Here are Sir J. Westland's words:—"There is first of all the head of Military Services, in which we are told such an immense increase of expenditure has taken place. The statement I have drawn up carries on the expenditure from the time before the increase of the Native and British Army in 1886. It will be seen that the expenditure upon the Army at the beginning of the period was about 14 millions sterling. It has now, notwithstanding that increase, come down to 13½ millions sterling." Then, with reference to the Civil Services, he said:—"Here also I would wish to point out that the expenditure has decreased. In the first three years it was 15·2 millions sterling, now it has come down to 11·8 millions. So that here if you take the measure in sterling, the other Services of the Government in all departments have immensely decreased in their burden. The result of all this naturally is that we have been lightening the incidence of the revenue and taxation." Finally, he put forward this claim:—"I think that the Government of India can show by the account I have to-day presented that it has practised most marvellous economy and has been able to meet this perpetually increasing demand without throwing correspondingly enhanced burdens upon the taxpayer."

7. Sir J. Westland states for the purposes of this Table that "a rupee of burden now is less than what a rupee of burden used to be." The annual averages of prices current in British India given at pp. 278-293 of the last Statistical Abstract for British India (1894) do not bear out this statement.

If "a rupee of burden now is less than what a rupee of burden used to be," a rupee would represent a smaller amount of produce now than it did formerly. For instance, if this statement be true, where a man had formerly to sell say twelve measures of corn to get a rupee, he would now have to sell only ten. This is the same thing as saying that prices of commodities must be higher than they were; in other words, prices must have gone up in terms of the rupee. But prices have done nothing of the kind. Looking at these Tables we are at once struck by the immense fluctuations from year to year, and as between district and district; but in no case is there a steady progressive rise of prices which could be said to correspond with the fall in Exchange. To take a few prominent examples. Bengal has more acres under rice than all the other provinces of India taken together, yet in 1879, when Exchange was at 1s. 8d., we find that in Calcutta the rupee would purchase 10·83 seers of rice; and in 1892, when Exchange was at 1s. 3d., the rupee would purchase 10·9 seers, or practically the same amount. Taking the same two years we find that wheat has either remained stationary or slightly fallen in price throughout the whole of India, in spite of a growing export trade; while such typical staples as jowar and bajra have generally declined in price throughout Bombay, Madras, the North-West Provinces, and the Punjab.

8. The meaning of this is clear. A rupee of revenue now paid by the Indian taxpayer represents, roughly speaking, the same amount of produce (and in some cases rather more) that a rupee of revenue used to represent before the great fall in Exchange. So far as Agricultural Statistics prove anything they prove an absolute want of correspondence between the purchasing power of the rupee in India and its exchange value with foreign countries using a gold standard. Further, these average annual prices seem to point irresistibly to the conclusion, that over a long series of years a rupee of burden now is *not* less than a rupee of burden used to be.

9. The fallacy, then, is the assumption that with a low Exchange the Indian taxpayer can get more rupees for his rice, wheat, or other produce, because an English banker can get more rupees for his sovereigns than formerly. As between England and India the rupee merely represents so much silver, the value of which in England is liable to be affected by the fluctuations of supply and demand; but in India the rupee is the only legal tender, and therefore the only standard of the value of the whole produce of the country. In England silver has fallen in value in relation to gold, but in India the rupee has not materially changed in value in relation to produce; consequently the value of the rupee in pounds sterling in England has no connection with its value in produce in India.

10. In order to show how misleading such methods of comparison may be, let us see what would be the effect of converting Imperial Expenditure or the National Debt into rupees in 1883-4 and 1893-4 at the Exchange of those years respectively. The results of this comparison are sufficiently startling as the following figures indicate:—

Imperial Expenditure (Net) 1883-4 £75,000,000 = (at Rs. 12 = £1) Rx. 90,000,000
" " 1893-4 £79,000,000 = (at Rs. 16 = £1) Rx. 126,400,000
Increase in ten years £4,000,000 *or* Rx. 36,400,000

To complete the calculation if we now re-convert the increase of Rx. 36,400,000 into sterling at the rate of the year (Rs. 16=£1) we find that our expenditure really increased during the decade by £22,750,000 although a benighted system of keeping the accounts only disclosed an increase of £4,000,000! Again,—

National Debt	1883-4	£746,000,000=(at Rs. 12=£1)		Rx. 895,200,000
,, ,,	1893-4	£666,000,000=(at Rs. 16=£1)		Rx. 1,065,600,000
Decrease or Increase (!)		—£80,000,000	*or*	+Rx. 170,400,000

Again re-converting we find that while Englishmen were under the mistaken impression that during these ten years the Debt had been *reduced* by £80,000,000 it had in reality been *increased* by no less than £106,500,000!!

11. It is well known that Indian Accounts do not lend themselves readily to comparisons from year to year. Changes in the form of presenting those accounts, the fluctuating value of the rupee, and the fact that the Government of India engages in large commercial undertakings such as the Railways and Irrigation, all tend to make hasty comparisons illusory. Attempts have been made from time to time with more or less success to meet these difficulties. Thus the principal effects of a falling Exchange may be now clearly discriminated from 1875-76 onwards, thanks to a Table prepared by the Government of India and published as Appendix III of the Financial Statement for 1886-87—the accounts of later years being all presented in the same form. As has been noted, however, the cost of Exchange Compensation Allowance and of the sterling pay of the British soldier, which automatically increase with the falling rupee, are not yet differentiated in the tabular statements of account. The desirability of showing the Net Income and Expenditure of the Government of India in a more rational form than that formerly adopted in Appendices to succeeding Financial Statements has been recognised by the issue of a "Return of the Net Income and Expenditure of British India under certain specified heads for the ten years from 1883-4 to 1892-3" dated India Office, 13 July, 1894. This Return, however, issued on Mr. Fowler's motion, is not altogether satisfactory. The principal Tables in this Note have been prepared to a large extent in the form therein adopted, but in some of the items of account considerable modifications have been made with a view to giving a more accurate statement of the Net Income and Expenditure of the Government of India. The reasons upon which these modifications are based are given in a Memorandum appended to this Note (Appendix A).

12. To come now to the Budget for 1895-6. In the last seven years the gross Revenue and Expenditure of British India have increased by about 15¼ millions of tens-of-rupees as the following figures show:—

	Accounts 1888-9.	Budget 1895-6.	Increase.
Gross Revenue ...	Rx. 81,696,678	Rx. 96,924,300	Rx. 15,227,622
,, Expenditure	Rx. 81,659,660	Rx. 96,878,100	Rx. 15,218,440
Surplus	Rx. 37,018	Rx. 46,200	Rx. 9,182

During that same period the increase in Net Revenue and Expenditure, according to statements E and F published on pp. 86, 87 of the Financial

Statement for 1895-6, and founded on Mr. Fowler's Return above mentioned, was about $8\frac{1}{4}$ millions of tens-of-rupees.

	Accounts 1888-9.	Budget 1895-6.	Increase.
Net Revenue ...	Rx. 55,616,588	Rx. 63,741,100	Rx. 8,124,512
,, Expenditure	Rx. 55,579,570	Rx. 63,694,900	Rx. 8,115,330
Surplus	Rx. 37,018	Rx. 46,200	Rx. 9,182

Or according to the statement of Net Revenue and Expenditure prepared for this Note and given below, the increase in the last seven years has been Rx. 8,076,503 in Net Revenue and Rx. 8,067,321 in Net Expenditure.

	Accounts 1888-9.	Budget 1895-6.	Increase.
Net Revenue ...	Rx. 57,325,997	Rx. 65,402,500	Rx. 8,076,503
,, Expenditure	Rx. 57,288,979	Rx. 65,356,300	Rx. 8,067,321
Surplus	Rx. 37,018	Rx. 46,200	Rx. 9,182

13. The following Tables give in sufficient detail the differences between the Net Revenue and Expenditure of British India as shown in the Accounts for 1888-9 and as estimated by the Finance Minister for 1895-6. The amounts given include expenditure in England and that on account of Exchange.

TABLE I.—Showing the Net Revenue of the Government of India under certain specified heads, as shown in the Budget Estimate for 1895-6, compared with that shown in the Accounts for 1888-9. [Rx. 1 = Rs. 10.]

	ACCOUNTS, 1888-9.		BUDGET, 1895-6.		Increase (+) or Decrease (—).	
	1. Rx.	2. Rx.	3. Rx.	4. Rx.	5. Rx.	6. Rx.
I. Land Revenue: (Less Refunds and Drawbacks)						
1. Land Tax	22,970,289		26,322,800		+3,352,511	
2. Forest	1,347,174		1,639,900		+292,726	
		24,317,463		**27,962,700**		**+3,645,237**
II. Opium: (Less Refunds and Drawbacks)		**8,562,270**		**6,860,500**		**—1,701,770**
III. Taxation: (Less Refunds and Drawbacks)						
1. Salt	7,630,297		8,658,600		+1,028,303	
2. Stamps	3,883,338		4,596,200		+712,862	
3. Excise	4,678,961		5,505,300		+826,339	
4. Provincial Rates ..	3,037,374		3,648,000		+610,626	
5. Customs	1,301,861		4,676,900		+3,375,039	
6. Assessed Taxes ..	1,504,588		1,785,200		+280,612	
7. Registration ..	330,758		421,400		+90,642	
		22,367,177		**29,291,600**		**+6,924,423**
IV. Miscellaneous:						
1. Tributes	745,233		789,500		+34,267	
2. Gain by Exchange	951,453		88,400		—863,053	
3. Miscellaneous ..	382,401		409,800		+27,399	
		2,079,087		**1,287,700**		**—791,387**
GRAND TOTAL..		**57,325,997**		**65,402,500**		**+8,076,503**

TABLE II.—Showing the Net Expenditure of the Government of India under certain specified heads, as shown in the Budget Estimate for 1895-6 compared with that shown in the Accounts for 1888-9. [Rx. 1 = Rs. 10.]

	ACCOUNTS, 1888-9.		BUDGET, 1895-6.		Increase (+) or Decrease (−).	
	1. Rx.	2. Rx.	3. Rx.	4. Rx.	5. Rx.	6. Rx.
I. Collection of Revenue: (including Assignments and Compensations)						
1. Land and Forest ..	5,338,098		6,299,200		+961,102	
2. Opium..	2,599,574		2,760,300		+160,726	
3. Other heads	1,571,606		1,896,300		+324,694	
		9,509,278		**10,955,800**		**+1,446,522**
II. Debt Services:		**3,870,437**		**3,310,400**		**−560,037**
III. Civil Services:						
1. Civil Departments ..	11,505,582		13,749,300		+2,243,718	
2. Miscellaneous Charges	4,425,452		5,648,000		+1,222,548	
3. Buildings and Roads	3,640,317		4,044,100		+403,783	
		19,571,351		**23,441,400**		**+3,870,049**
IV. Military Services:						
1. Army	19,239,478		24,341,500		+5,102,022	
2. Military Works.. ..	1,065,662		1,120,500		+54,838	
		20,305,140		**25,462,000**		**+5,156,860**
V. Commercial Services:						
1. Post Office and Telegraphs	22,856		−119,600		−142,456	
2. Mint	−121,171		−3,900		+117,271	
3. Railways	2,233,392		2,148,200		−85,192	
4. Irrigation	722,246		566,200		−156,046	
		2,857,323		**2,590,900**		**−266,423**
VI. Special Services:						
1. Famine Relief	78,336		55,000		−23,336	
2. Construction of Railways	22,401		9,400		−13,001	
		100,737		**64,400**		**−36,337**
VII. Special Defence		**789,595**		**154,700**		**−634,895**
VIII. Provincial Surplus or Deficit		**+285,118**		**−623,300**		**−908,418**
GRAND TOTAL ..		**57,288,979**		**65,356,300**		**+8,067,321**

14. In order to understand the full significance of the above Tables it will be necessary to find out in the case of the increase in the Revenues how much is due to increased taxation; and in the case of the increase in the Expenditure, how much is due to the increased cost of Exchange. While it will also be necessary to note under what heads of expenditure the increase (apart from that due to Exchange) has taken place.

15. After the new Taxation imposed in January, 1888—namely, (1) an enhancement of the Salt Tax; (2) an import duty on petroleum; and (3) the extension of the Income Tax to Lower Burma—no new taxation of importance was resorted to until the recent imposition of general import duties, including, still more recently, those on cotton goods. These new import duties together account for about Rx. 3,000,000 of the total increase in the Revenues of about Rx. 8,000,000 (Financial Statement, 1895-6, p. 10, para. 35), leaving about Rx. 5,000,000 as the net increase in the Net Revenues in seven years on the basis of taxation existing in 1888-9. Three points only in connection with this increase require special notice.

1. The large increase in the Land Revenue of Rx. 3,645,237 is largely due to enhancement of assessments as the product of active settlement operations, and also, as to about Rx. 200,000, to a new Patwari cess in the North-West Provinces and Oudh.

2. The increase of Rx. 1,028,303 in Salt is partly due to the fact that the new duty materially checked consumption in the first year of its imposition (Financial Statement, 1888-9, pp. 9-10).

3. The large decrease in Miscellaneous Receipts of Rx. 791,387 is due to the fact that in 1888-9 a large gain was made in Exchange upon heavy remittance transactions of the subsidized Railway Companies (Financial Statement, 1889-90, p. 10). This is very much a matter of account.

16. With regard to the increase of Rx. 8,067,321 in the Net Expenditure the first thing to notice is that this is a net increase—certain heads of expenditure having largely increased while others have materially decreased. The following figures will bring out the significance of this point :

Increases.	Rx.	Decreases.	Rx.
Collection of Revenue	1,446,522	Debt Services... ...	560,037
Civil Services ...	3,870,049	Commercial Services ...	266,423
Army Military Works	5,156,860	Special Services ...	36,337
		Special Defence Works	634,895
		Change from Provincial surplus to deficit ...	908,418
	Rx. 10,473,431		Rx. 2,406,110

Net Increase as above ... Rx. 8,067,321.

Three points must be borne in mind with reference to these decreases :

1. The decrease in expenditure of over Rx. 826,460 in connection with the debt and commercial services is in spite of, and covers, a heavy additional increased cost of Exchange under those two heads amounting to no less than Rx. 3,435,379.

2. The original programme of special defence works is approaching completion ; hence the large saving of expenditure under this head, although the ordinary military expenditure continues its alarming rate of increase.

3. The improvement of expenditure by Rx. 908,418 under provincial surpluses or deficits simply means that nearly a million of the increased expenditure on the Civil Services will be met for this year by consuming the accumulated surpluses of the Provincial Governments, *i.e.*, the unspent portions of their allotments in former years.

17. It is now necessary to ascertain the part which Exchange has played in different ways in bringing about this composite increase in the expenditure. The following figures show, with reference to the whole of the expenditure shown in Table II., the net cost of Exchange shown in the column headed Exchange in the Finance Accounts for the years 1888-9 and 1895-6 :

Net cost of Exchange 1888-9	Rx. 6,819,550
" " 1895-6	Rx. 13,118,400
Increase in the 7 years	Rx. 6,298,850

In addition to this Exchange added directly to the burdens of the Indian Exchequer under the head of Exchange Compensation Allowance and additional rupee pay to the British soldier (whose pay is on a sterling basis), items however, not shown separately in the Finance Accounts, as already explained. These further additions together account for a sum of Rx. 2,110,900, made up as follows :

	1888-9. Rx.	1895-6. Rx.	Increase. Rx.
Exchange Compensation Allowance	Nil	1,456,500	1,456,500
Additional payment to British soldiers (approximate) ...	502,000	1,156,400	654,400
	Rx. 502,000	Rx. 2,612,900	Rx. 2,110,900

The total increased expenditure upon Exchange is therefore Rx. 8,409,750 made up as follows :—

(i) Increase shown in "Exchange" column ...	Rx. 6,298,850
(ii) Increase not shown in " " ...	Rx. 2,110,900
Total... ...	Rx. 8,409,750

18. Before analysing this increased cost of Exchange in relation to the increased expenditure two important points must be noted :

1. The increase of Rx. 6,298,850 in (i) is not entirely due to the fall in the Exchange value of the rupee but is partly due to an increase of £1,085,317 sterling in the net Home Charges (sterling expenditure less sterling receipts) *i.e.*, part of the increased cost of Exchange is simply the Exchange on additional remittances of gold. The following figures make this clear.

	1888-9.	1895-6.	Increase.
Net Home Charges	£14,656,783	£15,742,100	£1,085,317
Cost of Exchange on £14,656,783	Rx. 6,819,550	Rx. 12,213,970	Rx. 5,394,420

The cost of Exchange for 1895-6, as shown in the "Exchange" column of the Accounts, is therefore made up thus :

Increased cost on	£14,656,783	(Home Charges 1888-9)	=Rx. 5,394,420
Actual cost on ...	£1,085,317	(Increase for 1895-6)	=Rx. 904,430
Total	£15,742,100		Rx. 6,298,850

Thus Rx. 904,430 of the increased cost of Exchange is due to the increase of £1,085,317 in the Home Charges.

2. The increase of Rx. 2,110,900 in (ii) is chiefly due to Exchange Compensation Allowance, which was not a matter outside the control of the Government of India and is in reality a distinct increase of expenditure by no means automatic in its character. Further, even granted that some compensation was imperative, it might certainly be questioned whether in the existing state of Indian Finance such indiscriminating compensation allowance, which by reason of its indiscriminate nature has added so largely to Indian expenditure, was either wise or necessary.

19. We are now in a position to show the exact effect which the heavy fall in the value of the rupee since 1888-9 has had upon the increase in Indian expenditure. The following Table III. which analyses the various increases and decreases shown in Table II. will make this clear.

TABLE III.—Showing under certain specified heads the Increase, or Decrease (—), both in India and in England, of the Net Expenditure of the Government of India in the Budget Estimate of 1895-6 as compared with the Accounts for 1888-9 (as shown in Table II), classified as to, A, Civil and Military Expenditure and, B, Other Expenditure. Showing also the exact operation of Exchange in various forms in making up the total difference under these heads. [£ = Rx. = Rs. 10.]

Heads of Expenditure.	Increase or Decrease, excluding Exchange. India. 1.	Increase or Decrease, excluding Exchange. England. 2.	Total Increase or Decrease, excluding Exchange. (Total of cols. 1 and 2.) 3.	Increase in Cost of Exchange properly due to the fall in Exchange since 1888-9. 4.	Increase due to (*a*) Exchange Compensation Allowance and (*b*) sterling pay of British troops. 5.	Increase or Decrease due to Cost of Exchange on Increase of Sterling Charges. 6.	Total Increase or Decrease in any way due to Exchange. (Total of cols. 4, 5 and 6.) 7.	Total Increase or Decrease in Net Expenditure, as shown in Table II, col 6. (Total of cols. 3 and 7.) 8.
	Rx.	£	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
A. Civil and Military.								
II. Collection of Revenue	1,272,011	6,482	**1,278,493**	18,927	(*a*) 143,700	5,402	**168,029**	**+1,446,522**
III. Civil Departments, Miscellaneous Charges, and Civil Works	1,883,650	319,642	**2,203,292**	846,889	(*a*) 553,500	266,368	**1,666,757**	**+3,870,049**
IV. Army Services and Military Works	1,254,850	692,399	**1,947,249**	1,368,212	(*a*) 610,000 (*b*) 654,400	576,999	**3,209,611**	**+5,156,860**
Total Civil and Military	4,410,511	£1,018,523	**5,429,034**	2,234,028	1,961,600	848,769	**5,044,397**	**+10,473,431**
B. Other Expenditure:								
I. Debt Services	—1,721,881	126,446	**—1,595,435**	930,027	—	105,371	**1,035,398**	**—560,037**
V. Commercial Services	—2,793,798	127,394	**—2,666,404**	2,144,520	(*a*) 149,300	106,161	**2,399,981**	**—266,423**
VI. Special Services	—36,337	—	**—36,337**	—	—	—	**—**	**—36,337**
VII. Special Defence	—377,823	—187,046	**—564,869**	85,845	—	—155,871	**—70,026**	**—634,895**
VIII. Change from Provincial Surplus to Deficit	—908,418	—	**—908,418**	—	—	—	**—**	**—908,418**
Total other Expenditure	—5,838,257	£66,794	**—5,771,463**	3,160,392	149,300	55,661	**3,365,353**	**—2,406,110**
GRAND TOTAL	—1,427,746	£1,085,317	**—342,429**	5,394,420	2,110,900	904,430	**8,409,750**	**+8,067,321**

Note:—The total amount for Exchange Compensation Allowance in 1895-6, namely, Rx. 1,456,500, is taken from a Table given at para. 145 of the F. S. 1895-6. Its distribution among the heads of expenditure in this Table has been roughly estimated by reference to the Table above mentioned and more complete Tables given at paras. 75 and 113 of the F. S. 1894-5. Note also in this connection para. 18, section 2.

20. The above Table in conjunction with Tables I. and II. summarizes while it analyzes the increase in Indian Expenditure during the last seven years. The large differences in the results shown compared with those given in Table II. of the Note on Sir J. Westland's previous Budget, namely that for 1894-5, are chiefly accounted for by the fact that the present comparison is made with the year 1888-9 when Net Civil and Military Expenditure had already increased by nearly 5½ millions (only half of which might be said to be due to Exchange in some form or another) over the standard of comparison then taken, namely the average of the years 1882-3 to 1884-5. The more complete apportionment of increase due to Exchange, and the fall of 1½d. in Exchange from 14½d. (the average rate shown in the Financial Statement for 1894-5) to 13·09d., the actual rate estimated for the year 1895-6, have also materially affected the figures. Nevertheless this present Table fully supports and confirms the main propositions deduced from the examination of last year's Indian Budget. Those propositions are as follows: "Loss by Exchange is not the sole (or even the principal) cause of the existing financial difficulties," but "the increase in Military and Civil Expenditure is the true source of the present embarrassment."

21. We will now put the facts which Table III. discloses into a series of propositions. There is, however, one paramount fact which must never be lost sight of in discussions on Indian Finance—one vital consideration of policy, the suicidal neglect of which, more perhaps than any wilful extravagance, has brought Indian Finances into their present perilous position. That fact is this. Exchange has long ceased to be an uncertain element in Indian Finance. For the last ten years at least Indian Financiers have known, or ought to have known, that they could not rely upon the maintenance of the Exchange from year to year, or even from month to month. A fall in Exchange with its added burdens upon the Indian Exchequer was a thing to be taken seriously into account by every prudent Finance Minister—and not merely a matter for complaint, as the Act of Providence which no strong measures might forestall. For the last ten years the Government of India have been in the position of a householder who, in addition to the growing charges of a growing family, has to face with an income which does not grow in sufficient proportion, a steady rise in the prices of the necessaries of life. Obviously the only proper way in which to meet such a case is by economy. But if under these circumstances the householder, refusing to economize, increases his expenditure, he must soon be involved in bankruptcy, and has no right to complain of a misfortune which he would thus have deliberately invited. Nor would it avail him anything to urge that this fresh expenditure was eminently useful and desirable, or even necessary for a man in his position. He should cut his coat according to his cloth.

22. But this adaptation of Expenditure to Revenue is what the Government of India will not do. It would almost seem that the great spending departments make up their estimates on the Exchange of the previous year, and after absorbing any increase of Revenue, look to the Finance Minister to provide for any additional charge, due to the probable fall in Exchange, by additional taxation. In the last ten years of falling Exchange, the Government of India have added more than £1,500,000 to the Home Charges, which with the rupee approaching 1s. means an additional charge upon the Revenues of India of about

Rx. 3,000,000—roughly speaking, the amount of the new import duties. Here, at any rate, we have a very tangible result:—the trade of England and India hampered because the Government of India would not realise that it is unsound finance to increase the gold liabilities of a silver-using country in a time of falling Exchange. This of course is leaving out of account all the money which the yearly addition to the Home Charges has taken from the Indian taxpayer. The Government of India will say that this increase was necessary, in the sense of being useful. But Governments, like individuals, cannot exempt themselves from certain fundamental economic principles, and the Government of India, if it is to act from motives of common prudence, must, like the householder, learn to cut its coat according to its cloth.

23. Table III. then appears to establish the following propositions :—

1. During seven years the expenditure on the Civil and Military Services alone has increased by Rx. 5,429,034, quite apart from any increase due to Exchange; and if we add the Rx. 848,769 due to Exchange on the increased sterling charges, which is an increase within the control of the Government of India, we find that the increase on the Services amounts to the enormous total of Rx. 6,277,803 besides Rx. 4,195,628 which may be said to be due to the fall in Exchange.

2. While the Expenditure on the Civil and Military Services has been increasing by about Rx. 6,000,000 (leaving out of account the increases in the cost of collection of the Opium and Customs Revenue) other Expenditure, apart from the question of Exchange, has decreased to the extent of about Rx. 5,750,000.

3. In Civil and Military Expenditure we find, instead of economies to meet the heavy burden of Rx. 4,195,628 due to the fall in Exchange, Rx. 6,277,803 of additional Expenditure—in other words, for every rupee of additional burden entailed by the fall in Exchange, the Services add another rupee and a half on their own account.

4. In other Expenditure we find the heavy burden of Rx. 3,309,692, due to the fall in Exchange, completely wiped out by reduced charges or increased profits amounting in the aggregate to Rx. 5,715,802 (*i.e.*, Rx. 5,771,463—Rx. 55,661), leaving Expenditure less, in spite of Exchange, by Rx. 2,406,110—in other words, every rupee of additional burden entailed by the fall in Exchange is met by a saving of a rupee and three quarters.

5. The enormous increase in seven years of nearly Rx. 10,500,000 in Civil and Military Expenditure (of which about two-fifths can be said to be due to the fall in Exchange) has (i) consumed all the natural increase in the Revenues of about Rx. 5,000,000; (ii) used up all the decrease in other Expenditure of about Rx. 2,500,000 (obtained, after paying for Rx. 3,300,000 due to Exchange, partly by reduction of charges, partly by increase of profits, partly by starving useful and reproductive services, and partly by meeting the Expenditure of the year out of past savings); and (iii) further necessitated the imposition of fresh taxation to the extent of Rx. 3,000,000 as shown by the following figures :—

	Rx. (000's omitted)		Rx. (000's omitted)	Rx.
Increase in Civil and Military Expenditure	6,250	Increase in Revenue		5,000
Add—Exchange ...	4,250	Decrease in Expenditure	5,750	
		Deduct—Increase in Exchange ...	3,250	
		Net Decrease in Expenditure		2,500
		New Taxation		3,000
TOTAL	10,500	TOTAL		10,500

24. Now it is certain that the Government of India will have a reason, good or bad, for every increase of expenditure; it is probable that with regard to some of the items they will be able to show a supreme necessity; but the advisability of an increase here or the necessity of an increase there is not the question at issue. It may be admitted at once that a certain amount of increased expenditure by the Government of India was not only necessary, but desirable in the interests of good government, and even legitimate under all the circumstances. The real point, however, is that the Government of India have not been content with a moderate increase of expenditure, but have continued, in reckless disregard of the capacities of Indian Revenues, to increase expenditure on the Civil and Military Services (however useful and desirable that expenditure may be) at a rate which under all the circumstances is absolutely unjustifiable.

25. For let us examine the position of affairs in the light of the Tables which we have given, and let us see what increase of expenditure was possible to the Government of India in the last seven years, without the help of new taxation, and supposing counsels of ordinary prudence to have prevailed. With the help of the Patwari cess (Rx. 200,000) and a small tax on beer and spirits (Rx. 100,000) the Government of India, without resorting to the new Import Duties, would have had an increase of Rx. 5,000,000 in Net Revenue to deal with. In addition to this, they would have had, without taking into account the doubtful expedient of absorbing provincial deposits—in fact, keeping a provincial surplus of about Rx. 250,000—a saving in expenditure of about Rx. 1,500,000 (after meeting a considerable portion of the increased charge due to Exchange). This would give them Rx. 6,500,000 available for increased expenditure on the Services.

26. How might this money have been spent? Under no circumstances should an increase of over £1,000,000 in the Home Charges, making with the ruinous rate of Exchange a charge on Indian Revenues of about Rx. 2,000,000, have been incurred in seven years of falling Exchange. We have then the Rx. 6,500,000 to meet the cost of Exchange on Civil and Military Expenditure, and the increased expenditure on the Services. Exchange would have absorbed about Rx. 4,250,000 of this amount, and the charge for Collection of Revenue might be fairly expected to show a large increase (though not so large as actually took place) say, Rx. 750,000. We have thus left Rx. 1,500,000 (with Exchange provided for) available for increased expenditure, if absolutely necessary, on the Services—representing an increase of nearly 4½% in seven years, apart from the increase entailed by Exchange.

27. But we would go further and insist upon the fact that a time of financial stress and difficulty is not a time for any increase of expenditure that can possibly be avoided, least of all for increased expenditure on an army which is already the heaviest financial burden, in proportion to Net Revenue, of any government in the world. In 1884-5, apart from any charge due in any way to Exchange and excluding expenditure on Special Defence Works, the ordinary expenditure on the Military Services was Rx. 16,000,000; in 1888-9 it was Rx. 18,000,000; and in 1895-6 it is Rx. 20,000,000. Be it remembered that in these increases Exchange played no part in any shape or form. If the increase of Rx. 2,000,000 in the four years was due to the large increase in the Army, against which many of those best qualified to judge so strongly protested, what plea can be put forward in justification for a further additional charge of Rx. 2,000,000 in the last seven years? In Appendix B will be found a more detailed examination of Indian Military Expenditure from 1875-6—1892-3, with reference to a Parliamentary Return recently issued on the subject.

W. WEDDERBURN,
Chairman, British Committee,
Indian National Congress.
H. MORGAN-BROWNE,
Secretary, British Committee,
Indian National Congress.

OFFICES OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE
OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

18*th June*, 1895.

APPENDIX A.

MEMORANDUM

ON THE NET REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

1. At pp. 86 and 87 of the Financial Statement of the Government of India for 1895-6 two statements (E and F) are given purporting to show the Net Income and Expenditure of the Government of India in India and England for certain specified years. These statements are, with some modifications, founded upon a Parliamentary Return moved for by Mr. Fowler, and are framed on practically the same principles with regard to Indian Finance as those of a former Return of Mr. Fowler's with reference to the Accounts of the United Kingdom.

2. In presenting the Accounts of a Government the object in view is to show the real cost of Government to the people. It is important on the one hand that every penny received, either by way of taxes, or by way of profit to the Government as owner of State property or contractor for State service, should be shown in full, and on the other hand, that the expenditure should not be unduly swollen by charges which are not a burden on the taxpayers of the country.

3. It is presumably with this object that these statements have been drawn up, and it is to the apparent failure of these statements in certain important particulars to exactly achieve this object that it is here proposed to direct attention. As they are of most practical moment it will be convenient to take the figures for 1895-6 (Budget Estimate), given in Statement E; two tables are appended showing the corrections which it is suggested should be made in the figures.

PART I.—INCOME, 1895-6.

4. I. LAND REVENUE, ETC.—

In this are included—1. Land Revenue, 2. Forest, and 3. Tributes from Native States, with a total of Rx. 28,752,200, from which is deducted Rx. 1,115,000 on account of assignments from Land Revenue, etc., giving a net total of Rx. 27,637,200 as the Land Revenue.

Now, in the first place, it is submitted that the Tributes from Native States should not be classed as Land Revenue. In the second place assignments ought not to be deducted. This latter sum, which consists chiefly of payments made in return for lands of which the revenue has been surrendered to the Government, ought not to be treated as a set-off to revenue, but should appear on the expenditure side as part of the expenses incurred in raising the revenue from land. For instance, the Rx. 800,000, or so, paid in the Bombay Presidency to Inamdars and other Grantees is in no sense a refund of revenue collected, but an allowance by way of purchase of a certain amount of revenue which had formerly been granted away by the State for service done. To deduct a large sum like Rx. 1,115,000 from the land revenue in these circumstances is misleading, for every rupee of this amount is actually paid in land tax to the Government, and it is no relief to the cultivators of the soil to pay land tax to Government where before they paid rent or land dues to State assignees.

5. II and III. Opium and Taxation—

As in the case of Land Revenue, Assignments and Compensations ought not to be deducted from income, but should appear as part of the cost of getting in the Revenue. Of the Rx. 419,000 deducted as Assignments and Compensations under "Other Heads" of Revenue about Rx. 100,000 represents compensation for Sayer or Transit Dues, abolished 1834-44; and about Rx. 300,000 represents Salt Compensation to various States, and under conventions with the French Government, the Sambhar Lake Treaty, etc., all of which, as necessary to maintain the Government's salt monopoly, is obviously a part of the cost of producing the Salt Revenue.

6. IV. Commercial Services—

This is a difficult heading to deal with. It is obviously an inconsistency in the statement, which purports to give net income and expenditure, to show amounts on both sides of the account under a general heading of Commercial Services. For the whole Commercial Services of the Government cannot be carried on both at a profit and a loss; and if some services are profitable and others the reverse, then it is a question whether a general heading should be retained. There are really four distinct Commercial Services—the Post Office and Telegraph, the Mint, the Railways, and Irrigation. If the general heading of Commercial Services, with a general total, is to be retained, then the net profit or loss from all four services should appear on one side of the account alone; if the general heading is to be discarded, then each service will appear as revenue or expenditure according as it yields a profit or loss to the Government. On the whole, the better course appears to be to retain the general heading with the general total, showing clearly how this result is arrived at. There seems to be no object in swelling the receipts by profits on some commercial transactions, if the general commercial enterprise of the Government results in a charge on the national income and is a burden, however advantageous may be the results, on the taxpayers of the country.

7. V. Miscellaneous Receipts—

1. *Mint.* This is clearly a Commercial Service, and none the less so because a strict Government monopoly, like the Post Office.

2. *Gain by Exchange.* This is largely a matter of Account, and properly treated as a portion of Miscellaneous Receipts.

3. *Miscellaneous.* The treatment of this sub-head is somewhat misleading. It is a fallacy to assume that Miscellaneous Receipts and Miscellaneous Expenditure have anything in common which justifies the setting off of one against the other. As a matter of fact the Miscellaneous Receipts consist principally of the following: Unclaimed Deposits, Premium on Bills, Rents, Fees, Fines and Forfeitures, Percentages on European Stores; whereas the Miscellaneous Expenditure is chiefly made up of charges for remittance of Treasure, Donations for Charitable Purposes, Rewards for Destruction of Wild Animals, Petty Provincial and Local Establishments, Rents, Rates and Taxes, Unforeseen Charges. If these various items cannot be placed under more specific headings, there is no objection to their being classed as Miscellaneous; but the two totals being made up of different and unrelated amounts must appear on each side of the Account, *i.e.*, Rx. 409,800 as Miscellaneous Receipts and Rx. 245,600 as Miscellaneous Charges.

Part II.—EXPENDITURE, 1895-6.

8. I and II. Debt and Military Services—

No remark, but see para. 12.

9. III. Collection of Revenue—

The figures require correction by the addition under *Land*, *Opium*, and *Other Heads* of the

Amounts for Assignments and Compensations being Rx. 1,115,000, Rx. 5,100 and Rx. 419,200 respectively. (See above, paras. 4 and 5.)

10. IV. COMMERCIAL SERVICES—

The figures require correction as explained in paras. 6 and 7.

11. V. CIVIL SERVICES—

The arrangement of this heading and the figures given seem open to serious objection.

1. *Civil Departments* and, 5. *Civil Works.* No remark.

2. *Miscellaneous Civil Charges.* To this must be added the gross total of Miscellaneous Charges referred to in para. 7, *i.e.*, Rx. 245,600.

3. *Famine Relief and Insurance.* Whether this is regarded as a separate Fund or as a special application of a compulsory surplus, it has obviously no place under a general heading of Civil Services.

4. Similarly, *Railway Construction* is a matter totally distinct from Civil Service Expenditure.

Both 3 and 4 are items of Expenditure which, rightly or wrongly, fluctuate enormously; and to include these under a general heading like Civil Services is to render the totals under that heading misleading when comparisons are instituted between different years, while at the same time no advantage whatever is derived from such a system.

12. The following tables, showing what would be the result of making the foregoing corrections, have been arranged with a slightly different order in the heads of account and a re-arrangement of some of the sub-heads. Thus, as a matter of logical presentation the charges for collection of revenue should appear first in a summary statement of expenditure, followed by the Debt Services, as in fact they do in the accounts of the Government of India. Then, as to re-arrangement: The cost of Special Defence Works is put under a separate heading altogether, just as war expenditure should be, so that the total ordinary military expenditure may be easily compared with years when there were no special defence works to swell the total. Again, the adjustment of the Imperial Account by means of the provincial surplus or deficit is shown quite separately, so that the actual total expenditure on the Civil Services may be clearly seen from year to year.

STATEMENT IF AMENDED AS SUGGESTED.

PART I.—INCOME (NET).

		Budget, 1895-6.
I. Land Revenue	Rx.	Rx.
1. Land	26,322,800	
2. Forest	1,639,900	
		27,962,700
N.B.—Tributes transferred to Miscellaneous; and Assignments, which are deducted in the Statement, have been transferred to Expenditure.		
II. Opium	.. ..	**6,860,500**
N.B.—Assignments, which are deducted in the Statement, have been transferred to Expenditure.		
III. Taxation	.. ..	**29,291,600**
N.B.—Assignments, which are deducted in the Statement, have been transferred to Expenditure.		
N.B. Commercial Services resulted in a net loss and therefore all appear on the Expenditure side of the account.		
IV. Miscellaneous		
	Rx.	
1. Tributes from Native States	789,500	
2. Gain by Exchange	88,400	
3. Miscellaneous	409,800	
		1,287,700
N.B.—Mint transferred to Commercial Services on the Expenditure side of the Account.		
GRAND TOTAL		**Rx. 65,402,500**

PART II.—EXPENDITURE (NET).

Budget, 1895-6.

	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
I. **Collection of Revenue** (Including Assignments and Compensations):—				
1. LAND, ETC.—				
i. Collection of Land Tax		4,189,100		
ii. Assignments and Compensations		1,115,000		
iii. Collection of Forest Revenue		995,100		
			6,299,200	
2. OPIUM—				
i. Collection of Tax		2,755,200		
ii. Compensations		5,100		
			2,760,300	
3. TAXES—				
i. Salt—				
(1) Collection	534,100			
(2) Compensations (Approximate)	300,000			
		834,100		
ii. Stamps		197,100		
iii. Excise		210,100		
iv. Provincial Rates		55,900		
v. Customs—				
(1) Collection	210,300			
(2) Compensations (Approximate)	100,000			
		310,300		
vi. Assessed Taxes		31,800		
vii. Registration		237,800		
		1,877,100		
Add:—Sundry Compensations (balance of Rx. 419,200)		19,200		
			1,896,300	
				10,955,800
II. **Debt Services**				3,310,400
III. **Civil Services.**				
1. Civil Departments			13,749,300	
2. Miscellaneous Civil Charges (v. para. 7)			5,648,000	
3. Civil Works (Buildings and Roads)			4,044,100	
				23,441,400
IV. **Military Services.**				
1. Army			24,341,500	
2. Military Works			1,120,500	
				25,462,000
V. **Commercial Services.**				
1. Postal Services (Net profit)			—119,600	
2. Mint (Net profit)			—3,900	
3. Railways (Net loss)			2,148,200	
4. Irrigation (Net loss)			566,200	
				2,590,900
VI. **Special Services** (*Vide* Mr. Fowler's Return relating to the United Kingdom).				
1. Famine Relief and Insurance			55,000	
2. Construction of Railways			9,400	
				64,400
VII. **Special Defence**				154,700
VIII. **Provincial Surplus, or Deficit**				—623,300
GRAND TOTAL				**Rx. 65,356,300**
Excess of Income over Expenditure (as in the Statement)				**46,200**
				Rx. 65,402,500

APPENDIX B.

INDIAN MILITARY EXPENDITURE, 1875-6—1892-3.

1. There was issued in June, 1894, an important Parliamentary Return, which professes to show the Military Expenditure of the Government of India in India and England for each year, from 1875-6 to 1892-3, and purports to explain the increase of Rx. 7,717,214 in this Expenditure during these eighteen years.

2. The first criticism which we have to offer is that this is only a partial Return; it does not show *all* the Military Expenditure of the Government of India—the important items of Military Works and Special Defence Works having been completely ignored. It is not easy to understand upon what principle expenditure so exclusively Military as this has been left out in a Return of Indian Military Expenditure. In 1875-76 the Indian Government had not yet begun to spend lakhs of rupees on so-called Special Defence Works, and the net amount spent on Military Works was Rx. 1,321,260: in 1892-93 the total Net Expenditure on Military and Special Defence Works was Rx. 1,609,585, showing an increase of Rx. 288,325.

3. In the next place, the figures given in the Return relate to Gross Expenditure, whereas Net Expenditure, *i.e.*, the amount spent less the Military receipts under the various headings, is obviously a more accurate statement of the Cost of the Military Services to the Government of India. Moreover, owing to the fact that receipts on account of Military Services, etc., have diminished, due probably to changes of system, the figures for the earlier years are relatively higher than those for the later years; thus the receipts in aid, as we may call them, for the Army, amounted in 1875-76 to Rx. 1,057,377, and in 1892-93 to Rx. 864,320, or a decrease of Rx. 193,057, which would mean so much more increase of net Expenditure between the two years taken.

4. Now if we take the figures of the Return and make the additions and corrections here indicated, instead of an increase of Rx. 7,717,214, as shown therein, we shall find that the true increase in Indian Military Expenditure as between the years 1875-76 and 1892-93 amounts to Rx. 8,198,596 or Rx. 481,382 over and above that shown in the Return.

5. The third criticism we have to make relates to the method adopted in dealing with the figures. Expenditure on Military operations, etc., is classed in the Return as exceptional; but it is a little confusing to find it also included under the ordinary headings of effective Expenditure in India, and indistinguishable, except as to that charged under Military operations in Afghanistan and Egypt, and Mobilization, among such items as Regimental Pay, Commissariat Establishments, etc. The disadvantage of this is great. It renders extremely difficult, if not altogether impossible, any attempt to make comparisons between different years under special headings, while by producing large fluctuations in the charges under any given heading it tends to conceal the true state of the case, which is in almost every item a steady increase all along the line. For instance in 1891-92 the return classes nearly Rx. 1,500,000 as exceptional Expenditure out of a total of Rx. 14,800,000 for effective Army Services in India, but it is impossible from the Return to find out under what headings of Expenditure this total of Rx. 1,500,000 should be distributed.

6. Nevertheless this is a very valuable Return so far as it goes, for it places on record, in an accessible form, the cost of those vague things "Military operations" and "Scientific frontiers," showing on the Government of India's own admission that during the eight years ending 1892-3 these costly abstractions have consumed more than Rx. 11,000,000. But perhaps the most important fact which this return brings to light is the ease with which the burdens of military aggressions beyond the frontier are smothered under general headings of ordinary military expenditure. The process serves a double purpose; in the first place it conceals the cost of a forward policy, in the second place it affords the Government of India a convenient plea for discouraging comparisons founded on the official accounts.

7. Let us, however, examine the Government of India's War Bill for the 18 years covered by the Return; here it is:—[N.B.—The heading "Quetta" is to some extent misleading, as it imparts a merely local significance to what was in reality an imperial matter. The Rx. 2,288,071 under this head was mainly, if not wholly, a charge for preparations against Russia—war preparations—in 1885.]

	Rx.
Afghanistan	18,190,132
Egypt	1,224,016
Burma	6,073,500
Quetta	2,288,071
Hazara	311,032
Lushai and Chin Hills	839,774
Sikkim	285,916
Manipur	323,407
Miranzai	196,536
Minor operations	326,553
Mobilization	405,945
Camps of exercise	146,227
Total	Rx. 30,611,109

It is not generally known that during the eight years ending 1892-3, Rx. 11,032,781 were spent on expeditions and warlike preparations which were not deemed worthy of separate headings in the ordinary accounts as they come before the public scrutiny.

8. Now it is a noteworthy fact that apart from the Afghan and Egyptian wars practically the whole of these exceptional payments on account of these "operations" are concentrated into the eight years ending 1892-3, during which time the expenditure on this account was never less than Rx. 750,000 and was as high as nearly Rx. 3,000,000, averaging about Rx. 1,500,000 in each year. Moreover this is only a part of the truth which this return brings to light. For when we come to look at the figures more closely we find that the period of 18 years naturally divides itself into two periods, one of ten years, and the other of 8 years; and that the first and longer period was one of comparative stability in the normal military charges, exhibiting as shown in the Return an increase of only Rx. 1,250,000, of which considerably more than Rx. 750,000 was due to increased cost of Exchange; while the second and shorter period exhibits, again according to the Return, the large increase of Rx. 6,500,000, of which less than Rx. 2,500,000 was due to increased cost of Exchange, leaving over Rx. 4,000,000 added military expenditure in eight years.

9. Here then is the cardinal fact which this Return discloses. On a review of Military Expenditure for the eighteen years ending 1892-3 we find that out of a total increase of 7¾ crores of rupees no less than 6½ crores took place in the last eight years, a period which exactly coincides with a chronic state of expeditionary activity upon the frontiers of British India, rendered possible, if not directly induced, by a large and, in the eyes of some of the highest authorities, absolutely unnecessary increase in the strength of the Army. This is what the Return discloses; but if we go a little further and give the true facts of the case by adding the increased Expenditure on Military works of all kinds and by ascertaining the net Expenditure, the result is even more startling. In the eighteen years the total net increase becomes Rx. 8,198,596, of which Rx. 7,106,511, or seven-eighths of the whole is crowded into the last eight years. The two following Tables show how these results are arrived at, the first giving the figures of the Return, the second showing the true increase in total net Military Expenditure:

TABLE I.—INDIAN MILITARY EXPENDITURE (Gross Amounts shown in Parliamentary Return dated 8th June, 1894) IN RX. AND £.

Gross Expenditure.	1875-76	1884-85	1892-93	Increase 1st period of 10 years.	Increase 2nd period of 8 years.	Total Increase 18 years.
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
India	11,725,264	12,023,629	15,589,091	298,365	3,565,462	3,863,827
England	3,583,194	3,974,421	4,888,794	391,227	914,373	1,305,600
Exchange	393,437	965,752	2,941,224	572,315	1,975,472	2,547,787
Total	15,701.895	16,963,802	23,419,109	1,261,907	6,455,307	7,717,214

TABLE II.—INDIAN MILITARY EXPENDITURE, SHOWING THAT ON ACCOUNT OF ALL MILITARY WORKS (Net Amounts taken from the Financial Statements of the Government of India, the figures for 1875-76 and 1884-85 being taken from Appendix 3 to the Financial Statement for 1886-87 when the Accounts were finally re-cast in their present form) IN RX. AND £.

Net Expenditure.	1875 -6.	1884 -5.	1892 -3.	Increase 1st period of 10 years.	Increase 2nd period of 8 years.	Total Increase 18 years.
A. Army:	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
India	10,786,800	11,292,633	14,799,048	505,833	3,506,415	4,012,248
England	3,476,048	3,906,703	4,842,420	430,655	935,717	1,366,372
Exchange	381,672	949,297	2,913,323	567,625	1,964,026	2,531,651
Total	14,644,520	16,148,633	22,554,791	1,504,113	6,406,158	7,910,271
B. Military Works:						
India	1,321,260	902,929	1,342,177	—418,331	439,248	20,917
England	—	5,071	166,960	5,071	161,889	166,960
Exchange	—	1,232	100,448	1,232	99,216	100,448
Total	1,321,260	909,232	1,609,585	—412,028	700,353	288,325
C. Total Military Expenditure:						
India	12,108,060	12,195,562	16,141,225	87,502	3,945,663	4,033,165
England	3,476,048	3,911,774	5,009,380	435,726	1,097,606	1,533,332
Exchange	381,672	950,529	3,013,771	568,857	2,063,242	2,632,099
GRAND TOTAL ..	15,965,780	17,057,865	24,164,376	1,092,085	7,106,511	8,198,596

10. Table II. shows us many things. Amongst others, we may note the following:—

1. From 1876 to 1885 the cost of the Army in India increased by only half a crore of rupees, or at the average rate of 5 lakhs a year. From 1885 to 1893 it increased by 3½ crores, or at the average rate of 43¾ lakhs a year—a rate of increase nearly nine times as great.

2. From 1876 to 1885 the increased cost of the Army in India was almost counterbalanced by a diminished expenditure on Military works, so that the increase in net Military expenditure in India during the ten years was only 8¾ lakhs of rupees; whereas from 1885 to 1893 the increased expenditure in the Army was supplemented by renewed activity on Military works, with the result that during these latter eight years net Military expenditure in India increased by nearly 4 crores of rupees, or at an average rate of 50 lakhs a year.

3. From 1876 to 1885 the sterling charges on account of Military expenditure increased

by £435,000; but from 1885 to 1893 they increased by £1,097,000, or an average annual increment in the first period of £43,500, and in the second period of £137,000, or a rate of increase more than three times as great.

4. We find that during the first and longer period the total net Military expenditure in India and England increased by about Rx. 500,000, and that during the second and shorter period it increased by about Rx. 5,000,000 (including about Rx. 400,000 due to increased rupee pay of British troops), or just ten times as much in eight years of nominal peace as it had increased in ten years which were disturbed by the Afghan and Egyptian wars. This means that in every one of the eight years after 1885 net Indian Military expenditure increased on the average by more than the whole increase during the ten years before 1885.

11. It would be unprofitable and futile to attempt to follow the Return in the "explanation" it offers of the admitted increase of Rx. 7,717,214 in Indian Military expenditure. As we have explained in paragraph 5, the Return is so made that it is impossible to ascertain the increases under particular headings apart from exceptional payments, which, of course, renders any such comparisons untrustworthy, and effectually prevents our checking or criticising in detail the explanation. We may, however, make a few general remarks thereon.

Out of the Rx. 7,717,214 the Return mentions specific increases under ten different headings to account for Rx. 7,200,723, leaving Rx. 516,491, which is explained in a general way. Of this Rx. 7,200,723, the most noteworthy items given are as follows:—

	Rx.	Rx.
Increase of Troops—		
British	958,092	
Native	659,246	
		1,617,338
Loss by Exchange—		
On pay of British Soldiers	592,000	
On Sterling Expenditure	2,547,787	
		3,139,787
Increase in Home Pensions		929,822
		5,686,947

12. With regard to the Loss by Exchange on Sterling Expenditure it must be borne in mind that this is not all due to a falling rupee, a large proportion of it being the loss by Exchange on new sterling charges. Thus in the eighteen years the Expenditure in England increased by £1,305,600 (taking the figures of the return) which represents about 26¾% of the total amount given for 1892-93, consequently 26¾% of the total cost of Exchange in 1892-93 had nothing to do with a depreciated rupee so far as a comparison with the year 1875-76 is concerned. This means that the increased cost of Exchange is really made up as follows:—

Increased loss by Exchange on sterling Expenditure—	
(*a*) Due to depreciation of the rupee	Rx. 1,761,010
(*b*) Due to increased charges	786,777
	Rx. 2,547,787

13. The loss by Exchange on fresh sterling charges was naturally largely foreseen, and cannot be properly called a loss by Exchange. It was an addition to the burdens of the Indian taxpayer which ought not to have been incurred with a falling rupee; and in any case the fall in the Exchange, so far as these additional charges are concerned, cannot be urged as the cause of the increased cost of making remittances to England. The same remarks apply to the amount stated to be loss by Exchange on the pay of British soldiers; a portion of this is due to the increase in the Army, and not primarily to the fall in Exchange.

14. Finally, here is the startling fact. During the eight years ending 1892-3 net Indian Military expenditure increased by no less than Rx. 7,106,511, which, broadly speaking, may be accounted for as follows:—

EIGHT YEARS' INCREASE IN TOTAL NET INDIAN MILITARY EXPENDITURE (1884-85 to 1892-93).

	Rx.
Increase of Troops	1,617,338
Increased rupee pay to British Soldiers (on account of low Exchange) .. .. (N.B.—In 1884-85 this already amounted to Rx. 184,000)	408,000
Increased Cost of Exchange on Home Charges as in 1884-85 (*i.e.*, £3,911,774) due to depreciation of the rupee.. .. (N.B.—The amount of the Home Charges in 1885 was about 78% of the Home Charges in 1893, consequently about 22% of the Total Loss by Exchange in 1893 is the direct result of increased sterling Expenditure and not primarily accountable to Exchange)	1,400,213
Balance of Increased Expenditure due to augmented pensions, Burma, Frontier Expeditions, added Sterling Charges, New Military Works, etc., etc.	3,680,960
	Rx. 7,106,511

Memorandum on Indian Financial Expenditure.

---

1. The accompanying six Tables have been prepared with the object of putting into a convenient form the main facts connected with Indian Financial Expenditure during the last twenty years—1875-6 to 1895-6. No attempt has been made either to justify or condemn any increase or decrease in expenditure, the sole purpose being to state the essential facts as disclosed by an analysis of the Finance Accounts of the Government of India.

2. Table I. gives the net expenditure of the Government of India from 1875-6 to 1895-6 (*Budget Estimate*). The figures for the years 1875-6 to 1883-4 have been compiled from Appendix III. of the Financial Statement for 1886-7, when the accounts for those years were finally re-cast in the form since adopted by the Government of India. The figures for the later years have been compiled from Statements E and F of the Financial Statement for 1895-6, with frequent reference to the Financial Statements of successive years.

3. The Table given in this Memorandum differs somewhat in form and substance from that in Statements E and F of the Financial Statement for 1895-6. Reasons for the modifications here adopted will be found in Appendix A. to a Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget recently published by this Committee. It will be sufficient here to explain briefly how the figures in the following Table have been obtained.

	Rx.
Taking the figures for the closed Accounts for 1893-4, the gross expenditure was	92,112,212
Of this, the Departmental Receipts, which are properly a set-off against expenditure under corresponding heads, amounted to	29,834,644
Leaving	62,277,568
Then deducting therefrom the Refunds and Drawbacks of Revenue	256,020
The balance is that shown in the present Table as Total Net Expenditure charged against Revenue	Rx. 62,021,548

4. In Table E to the Financial Statement for 1895-6 the Total Net Expenditure is given as Rx. 60,416,501, or less by Rx. 1,605,047 than the total shown above. This difference is accounted for as follows:—

	Rx.
Assignments and Compensations treated as expenditure and *not* deducted from Revenue	1,528,260
Miscellaneous Expenditure treated as expenditure in full—the Miscellaneous Receipts being entirely unrelated should not be treated as a set-off	273,831
Profits on Post Office and Telegraph and Mint placed under general heading of Commercial Services, and so operating in reduction of net charges under this general heading ...	−197,044
	Rx. 1,605,047

5. Table II. is supplemental to Table I. It shows with reference to the totals given in Table I. for each of the eight main heads of expenditure (1) the total increase or decrease from year to year; (2) the amount of this increase expended on Exchange, including—for those years where they operated —the increased Rupee pay of the British soldier (whose pay is on a sterling basis) and the charge for Exchange Compensation Allowance; and (3) the actual increase or decrease with Exchange totally excluded. The figures for (1) are in Roman type, those for (2) in italics, and those for (3) in black type.

6. With regard to the amount shown against Exchange in Table II. it must be borne in mind that this represents for each year the increased amount expended on Exchange, and not merely the extra amount due to the fall in Exchange. As during the twenty years of falling Exchange there was a steady increase in the Home Charges a portion of the increased cost of Exchange in nearly every year was really not due to the fall in Exchange but was due to, and a portion of, increased sterling expenditure.

7. Table III. further supplements Tables I. and II. It shows (1) the net expenditure of the Government of India under the principal heads (distinguishing that due to Exchange) for 1875-6, 1884-5, and 1895-6 (*Budget Estimate*); and (2) the increase or decrease in such expenditure for the three periods 1875-6 to 1884-5 (9 years), 1884-5 to 1895-6 (11 years), and 1875-6 to 1895-6 (20 years), respectively. The reason for selecting 1884-5, rather than 1885-6, as the middle year for the purposes of this comparison is that 1884-5 was the last of a series of four years of financial equilibrium and practically stationary expenditure, while 1885-6 was the first of a series of years (not yet completed) of financial instability, of rapidly increasing expenditure, and of heavy charges on account of military operations.

8. Tables IV., V. and VI. carry the analysis of the main increases or decreases in expenditure still further—Table IV. showing for the period 1875-6 to 1895-6 the exact effect of Exchange in this connection, and Tables V. and VI. showing the same thing for the periods 1875-6 to 1884-5 and 1884-5 to 1895-6 respectively.

9. The figures given in the Tables seem to establish the following facts:—

TOTAL EXPENDITURE.

(i) In the last 20 years the net expenditure of British India has risen from Rx. 46,450,000 to Rx. 65,350,000, showing an increase of Rx. 18,900,000. The total increase of Rx. 18,900,000 is made up of an increase of Rx. 20,900,000 under the three heads of *Collection of Revenue*, *Civil Services*, and *Military Services*, and a decrease of about Rx. 2,000,000 under other heads of expenditure.

(ii) In the last 20 years the total cost of Exchange (including that upon the sterling pay of British troops and Exchange Compensation Allowance) has increased by Rx. 14,350,000. The total increase of Rx. 14,350,000 is made up of an increase of Rx. 7,750,000 under the heads of Civil and Military Services (including Collection of Revenue) and Rx. 6,600,000 under other heads of expenditure.

(iii) In the last 20 years, excluding Exchange altogether, the Net Expenditure of British India has risen from Rx. 45,100,000 to Rx. 49,650,000, showing an increase of about Rx. 4,550,000. The total increase of Rx. 4,550,000 is made up of an increase of Rx. 13,150,000 under the three heads of *Collection of Revenue*, *Civil Services*, and *Military Services*, and a decrease of Rx. 8,600,000 under other heads of expenditure.

(iv) In the last twenty years, therefore, the total increase of Rx. 18,900,000 in the total Net Expenditure of British India is made up as follows:

	Rx.	Rx.
Increase in Civil and Military Services ...	13,150,000	
Add Increase in Cost of Exchange	7,750,000	
Total Increase ...	... ...	... 20,900,000
Decrease in other Expenditure	*8,600,000*	
Deduct Increase in Cost of Exchange ...	6,600,000	
Total Decrease...	... ...	... *2,000,000*
Net Total Increase ...	... ..	Rx. 18,900,000

(v) From 1875-6 to 1884-5 there was an increase in total net expenditure (excluding Exchange altogether) of Rx. 3,000,000; from 1884-5 to 1895-6 the increase is Rx. 1,550,000. The increase of Rx. 3,000,000 during the former period is made up of an increase of Rx. 4,200,000 under the heads of Civil and Military Services (including Collection of Revenue) and a decrease of Rx. 1,200,000 under other heads of expenditure; while the increase of Rx. 1,550,000 during the more recent period is made up of an increase of Rx. 8,950,000 in Civil and Military expenditure and a decrease of Rx. 7,400,000 in other expenditure.

HOME CHARGES.

(vi) In the last 20 years of falling Exchange the sterling expenditure of the Government of India has been increased by nearly £3,200,000, involving a further charge of Rx. 2,650,000 for Exchange, so that additional sterling expenditure of the Government of India has added Rx. 5,850,000 to Indian charges. Of this amount £1,450,000, with Exchange Rx. 1,250,000, total Rx. 2,700,000, falls under Civil and Military expenditure; and £1,700,000, with Exchange Rx. 1,450,000, total Rx. 3,150,000, falls under other heads of expenditure (almost entirely Railways and Debt).

(vii) In the last 11 years (from 1884-5 to 1895-6) over £900,000, involving nearly Rx. 800,000 for Exchange and making a total additional burden of Rx. 1,700,000, has been added to the Sterling Expenditure on the Civil and Military Services alone.

EXCHANGE.

(viii) In the last 20 years there has been an increase of Rx. 14,350,000, which in one way or another is claimed by the Government of India to be due to the fall in the Exchange value of the Rupee. But of this Rx. 2,650,000 is the present cost of Exchange on increases in sterling expenditure since 1875-6, and therefore not primarily due to the fall in Exchange, while Rx. 1,450,000 is due to the grant of Exchange Compensation Allowance, leaving Rx. 10,250,000 as the true increase in the cost of Exchange automatically brought about by the fall in Exchange.

(ix) Of the increase of Rx. 10,250,000 in 20 years, properly due to the fall in Exchange, about Rx. 5,000,000 falls upon the Commercial (chiefly Railways) and Debt Services, in which enhanced profits or economies have far more than counterbalanced this additional burden; leaving only Rx. 5,250,000 as the true additional burden thrown upon the Civil and Military Services during the last 20 years strictly on account of the fall in the Exchange value of the Rupee.

CIVIL SERVICES.

(x) In the last 20 years there has been an increase in the total net expenditure on the Civil Services (*i.e.*, Civil Departments, Miscellaneous Civil Charges, and Buildings and Roads) of Rx. 8,000,000. Of this increase Rx. 2,350,000 accrued during the first 9 years (1875-6 to 1884-5) and Rx. 5,650,000 during the last 11 years (1884-5 to 1895-6).

(xi) In the last 20 years, excluding Exchange altogether, there has been an increase in net Civil Service expenditure (exclusive of that on account of Collection of Revenue) of Rx. 5,500,000. Of this increase Rx. 2,050,000 accrued during the first 9 years (1875-6 to 1884-5) and Rx. 3,450,000 during the last 11 years (1884-5 to 1895-6).

MILITARY SERVICES.

(xii) In the last 20 years there has been an increase in the total net military expenditure of the Government of India (*i.e.*, Army Services and Military Works) of Rx. 9,500,000. Of this increase Rx. 1,100,000 accrued during the first 9 years (1875-6—1884-5) and Rx. 8,400,000 during the last 11 years (1884-5 to 1895-6).

(xiii) In the last 20 years, excluding Exchange altogether, there has been an increase in net military expenditure of Rx. 4,450,000, of which only Rx. 350,000 accrued during the first 9 years (1875-6 to 1884-5) and no less than Rx. 4,100,000 in the last 11 years (1884-5 to 1895-6).

(xiv) In March, 1885, Sir Auckland Colvin, at that time Indian Finance Minister, estimated the net cost of the Army (exclusive of war charges) at a little below £15,000,000, or, as it would now be expressed with exchange excluded, Rx. 15,000,000. This amount, he said, "may be considered to be about the normal military expenditure in India and in England." (F. S. 1885-6, para. 136.) If Rx. 1,000,000 be added for military works, the normal net expenditure on the military services, exclusive of that due to exchange, and not counting that spent on Special Defence, may be taken at Rx. 16,000,000, according to the Indian Government's standard.

The following figures show (1) the amount of the net expenditure on the military services (exchange excluded) in each year from 1876-7 to 1895-6; (2) the excess year by year over this standard; and (3) the aggregate of such excess expenditure during the 20 years.

YEAR.	Net Military Expenditure (Exchange excluded.)	Excess over Indian Government's Standard (Rx. 16,000,000).	
	Rx.	Rx.	
1876-77	16,029,710	29,710	Aggregate Excess over Indian Government's Standard during 9 years 1876-7 to 1884-5 **Rx. 18,239,980**
1877-78	16,884,476	884,476	
*1878-79	17,268,746	1,268,746	
*1879-80	21,560,932	5,560,932	
*1880-81	24,797,202	8,797,202	
1881-82	16,059,915	59,915	
1882-83	16,768,079	768,079	
1883-84	16,947,584	947,584	
†1884-85	15,923,336	*—76,664*	
†1885-86	18,692,977	2,692,977	Aggregate Excess over Indian Government's Standard during 11 years 1885-6 to 1895-6 **Rx. 33,541,705**
‡†1886-87	17,815,561	1,815,561	
‡1887-88	18,554,495	2,554,495	
‡1888-89	18,073,451	2,073,451	
‡1889-90	18,434,169	2,434,169	
‡1890-91	19,069,447	3,069,447	
‡1891-92	20,311,850	4,311,850	
‡1892-93	20,176,550	4,176,550	
‡1893-94	19,561,605	3,561,605	
§‡1894-95	18,830,900	2,830,900	
¶‡1895-96	20,020,700	4,020,700	
Aggregate excess over Indian Government's Standard during 20 years		**Rx. 51,781,685**	

* *Afghan War.*
† *Upper Burma.*
‡ *Army increased by* 27,000 *men.* [*Estimated extra charge about Rx.* 1,500,000 *annually.*]
§ *Revised Estimate.*
¶ *Budget Estimate.*

The aggregate excess Military charge during the 20 years of Rx. 51,800,000 is roughly made up as follows:

Afghan War	11,500,000
Annexation of Upper Burma	4,000,000
Increase in Army (9 full years)	13,500,000
Expeditions, Increased Expenditure, Occupation of Upper Burma, etc. ...	22,800,000
	Rx.51,800,000

W. WEDDERBURN,
Chairman, British Committee,
Indian National Congress.

H. MORGAN-BROWNE,
Secretary, British Committee,
Indian National Congress.

OFFICES OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE
OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.
26*th June*, 1895.

TABLE I. NET EXPENDITURE OF BRITISH INDIA

Heads of Expenditure.	1875–76.		1876–77.		1877–78.	
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
I. Collection of Revenue :						
1. Land and Forest . .	3,371,446		3,357,510		3,384,647	
2. Opium	2,218,643		2,841,647		2,661,538	
3. Other heads . . .	1,083,132		1,078,155		1,177,180	
4. Assignments, etc. .	903,524	7,576,745	878,983	8,156,295	867,122	8,090,487
II. Debt Services :		4,246,734		4,507,669		4,620,423
III. Civil Services :						
1. Civil Departments .	9,037,136		9,310,789		9,056,115	
2. Miscellaneous Civil Charges	3,557,116		3,577,952		3,525,143	
3. Buildings & Roads	2,838,837	15,433,089	2,843,230	15,731,971	2,379,750	14,961,008
IV. Military Services :						
1. Army	14,641,877		15,531,098		16,421,249	
2. Military Works . .	1,321,260		1,163,071		1,114,696	
Afghanistan . .	——		——		——	
* *Minor Expeditions*	2,643	15,965,780	——	16,694,169	——	17,535,945
V. Commercial Services :						
1. Posts & Telegraphs	336,625		281,855		263,171	
2. Mint	−83		−121,492		−307,733	
3. Railways	1,658,760		1,146,207		150,150	
4. Irrigation	1,147,068	3,042,370	1,021,869	2,328,439	991,674	1,097,262
VI. Special Services :						
1. Famine Relief . .	602,030		†2,145,517		†5,347,634	
2. Construction of Railways	29,680	631,710	38,260	2,183,777	50,896	5,398,530
VII. Special Defence . .		——		——		——
VIII. Provincial Surplus or Deficit		−434,681		−125,060		+367,802
GRAND TOTAL . .		46,461,747		49,477,260		52,071,457

* The figures for the years 1875-6—1892-3 represent the actual expenditure in India, and are taken from a Parliamentary Return entitled "East India (Military Expenditure)," and dated India Office, 8th June, 1894.

† Great Famine in Madras and Bombay.

FOR THE 21 YEARS 1875-6 TO 1895-6.

1878-79.		1879-80.		1880-81.		1881-82.	
Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
3,416,139		3,403,379		3,450,617		3,562,640	
1,698,929		2,067,524		2,028,775		2,057,554	
1,080,148		998,892		1,012,760		1,141,312	
1,032,118	7,227,334	1,142,645	7,612,440	1,215,013	7,707,165	1,194,440	7,955,946
	4,769,355		4,635,305		3,717,827		3,950,841
9,075,163		9,019,364		9,206,751		9,615,295	
3,734,299		3,769,585		3,891,767		4,066,833	
2,615,988	15,425,450	2,491,220	15,280,169	2,849,133	15,947,651	3,430,542	17,112,670
16,261,451		16,681,191		16,607,944		16,865,110	
1,151,039		928,052		932,441		1,020,248	
692,391		4,801,429		7,539,091		−1,487,682	
	18,104,881		22,410,672		25,079,476		16,397,676
252,926		126,657		149,021		293,725	
−66,361		−119,352		3,732		20,859	
2,075,695		1,570,478		1,044,050		285,584	
812,815	3,075,075	311,550	1,889,333	283,565	1,480,368	568,897	1,169,065
313,547		104,059		34,840		‡1,567,886	
171,782	485,329	1,842,733	1,946,792	2,473,654	2,508,494	512,655	2,080,541
	+715,405		+613,299		+297,961		+1,519,792
	49,802,829		54,388,010		56,738,942		50,186,531

‡ Beginning of Famine Insurance Fund, an annual sum of Rx.1,500,000 being granted for building protective railways, extinguishing debt, etc., as a precaution against future famines.

Table I.—*continued.*

NET EXPENDITURE OF BRITISH INDIA

Heads of Expenditure.	1882-83. Rx.	Rx.	1883-84. Rx.	Rx.	1884-85. Rx.	Rx.
I. Collection of Revenue :						
1. Land and Forest . .	3,611,135		3,979,921		4,042,784	
2. Opium	2,283,180		1,854,983		2,966,640	
3. Other Heads . . .	1,082,949		1,029,580		1,073,353	
4. Assignments, etc. .	1,195,087	8,172,351	1,238,840	8,103,324	1,275,442	9,358,219
II. Debt Services :		4,070,945		3,668,508		3,907,848
III. Civil Services :						
1. Civil Departments .	9,609,502		9,933,805		10,370,023	
2. Miscellaneous Civil Charges	3,986,372		3,928,261		3,947,381	
3. Buildings & Roads	3,858,497	17,454,371	4,283,257	18,145,323	3,484,948	17,802,352
IV. Military Services :						
1. Army	16,008,169		†17,103,737		15,989,714	
2. Military Works . .	920,418		975,397		909,232	
Afghanistan . .	17,869		——		——	
Egypt	609,285		51,736		——	
* *Quetta*	——		——		102,700	
* *Burma*	——		——		——	
* *Minor Expeditions*	——	17,555,741	——	18,130,870	56,219	17,057,865
V. Commercial Services :						
1. Posts & Telegraphs	335,889		410,825		441,207	
2. Mint	—95,222		—50,106		—93,804	
3. Railways	1,305,860		304,912		1,051,751	
4. Irrigation	716,027	2,262,554	547,200	1,212,831	573,017	1,972,171
VI. Special Services :						
1. Famine Relief. . .	1,495,972		1,522,813		1,548,357	
2. Construction of Railways	480,923	1,976,895	‡—176,295	1,346,518	263,501	1,811,858
VII. Special Defence .		——		——		——
VIII. Provincial Surplus or Deficit		—1,202,626		—464,679		—288,944
GRAND TOTAL . .		50,290,231		50,142,695		51,621,369

---

* The figures for the years 1875-6—1892-3 represent the actual expenditure in India, and are taken from a Parliamentary Return entitled "East India (Military Expenditure)," and dated India Office, 8th June, 1894.

† Including £1,000,000 paid to the Imperial Exchequer on account of Arrears for Non-effective Army Services (F. S. 1884-5, paras. 12 and 53).

‡ Refund of past expenditure.

1885-86.		1886-87.		1887-88.		1888-89.	
Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
4,095,280		4,184,017		4,206,479		4,305,957	
3,057,674		2,729,063		2,424,575		2,597,905	
1,049,613		1,171,642		1,114,164		1,119,181	
1,396,587	9,599,154	1,446,937	9,531,659	1,468,963	9,214,181	1,486,235	9,509,278
	3,631,879		3,639,855		4,695,199		3,870,437
10,816,283		11,236,858		11,410,622		11,505,582	
4,162,395		4,204,580		4,277,103		4,425,452	
2,941,933	17,920,611	3,600,939	19,042,377	3,667,064	19,354,789	3,640,317	19,571,351
16,312,783		§17,022,239		17,866,278		18,233,500	
927,762		873,254		1,191,647		1,065,662	
—		—		—		—	
—		—		—		—	
2,185,371		—		—		—	
631,000		1,517,800		1,475,300		631,600	
4,753	20,061,669	—	19,413,293	15,541	20,548,766	374,378	20,305,140
433,795		217,702		183,746		22,856	
—106,694		—99,922		—157,463		—121,171	
731,713		1,188,668		2,122,386		2,233,392	
715,469	1,774,283	653,949	1,960,397	747,372	2,896,041	722,246	2,857,323
1,500,000		¶309,020		91,408		78,336	
632,055	2,132,055	183,077	492,097	80,945	172,353	22,401	100,737
	—		325,626		456,017		789,595
	+523,882		+35,665		+370,591		+285,118
	55,643,533		54,440,969		57,707,937		57,288,979

---

§ Addition of 27,000 men to the established strength of the army, ultimately costing about Rx. 1,500,000 annually.

¶ Partial suspension of Famine Insurance Fund, which has not been fully restored since.

Table I.—*continued.* NET EXPENDITURE OF BRITISH INDIA

HEADS OF EXPENDITURE.	1889–90.		1890–91.		1891–92.	
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
I. Collection of Revenue:						
1. Land and Forest	4,404,229		4,460,709		4,679,052	
2. Opium	1,605,107		2,180,797		1,861,813	
3. Other Heads	1,114,892		1,148,754		1,220,084	
4. Assignments, etc.	1,544,448		1,510,092		1,531,860	
		8,668,676		**9,300,352**		**9,292,809**
II. Debt Services:		**3,367,762**		**3,264,254**		**3,435,733**
III. Civil Services:						
1. Civil Departments	11,679,034		11,774,192		12,197,685	
2. Miscellaneous Civil Charges	4,369,149		4,228,491		4,601,697	
3. Buildings & Roads	3,666,847		3,904,987		4,416,904	
		19,715,030		**19,907,670**		**21,216,286**
IV. Military Services:						
1. Army	18,876,319		19,154,573		20,219,161	
2. Military Works	1,094,944	—	1,176,631	—	1,164,724	—
* *Burma*	435,800	—	350,300	—	529,200	—
* *Minor Expeditions*	420,988	—	399,560	—	751,836	
		20,828,051		**21,081,064**		**22,664,921**
V. Commercial Services:						
1. Posts & Telegraphs	39,862		—22,813	—	—33,611	
2. Mint	—148,982		—232,264		—112,937	
3. Railways	1,852,601		687,291		315,864	
4. Irrigation	661,629		569,550		672,979	
		2,405,110		**1,001,764**		**842,295**
VI. Special Services:						
1. Famine Relief	600,000		600,000		1,268,319	
2. Construction of Railways	4,974		†—4,812		163,233	
		604,974		**595,188**		**1,431,552**
VII. Special Defence		**689,481**		**491,837**		**604,848**
VIII. Provincial Surplus or Deficit		**+548,996**		**—198,627**		**—240,924**
GRAND TOTAL		**56,828,080**		**55,443,502**		**59,247,520**

---

* The figures for the years 1875-6—1892-3 represent the actual expenditure in India, and are taken from a Parliamentary Return entitled "East India (Military Expenditure)," and dated India Office, 8th June, 1894.

† Refund of past expenditure.

FOR THE 21 YEARS 1875-6 TO 1895-6.

1892-93.		1893-94.		1894-95 (Revised Estimate).		1895-96 (Budget Estimate).	
Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
4,801,570		4,928,020		5,040,300		5,184,200	
1,602,496		1,876,607		1,646,400		2,755,200	
1,232,564		1,276,670		1,378,900		1,477,100	
1,567,776	9,204,406	1,528,260	9,609,557	1,549,300	9,614,900	1,539,300	10,955,800
	3,504,536		3,570,882		4,260,800		3,310,400
12,652,036		13,006,538		13,299,600		13,749,300	
5,094,494		5,184,698		5,629,300		5,648,000	
4,041,767	21,788,297	4,001,784	22,193,020	3,719,000	22,647,900	4,044,100	23,441,400
21,794,991		21,629,721		22,397,200		23,522,600	
1,151,525		1,134,714		951,700		1,120,500	
502,500		‡500,000		‡500,000		‡500,000	
257,300	23,706,316	§273,650	23,538,085	¶242,500	24,091,400	‖318,900	25,462,000
—33,000		—60,769		—195,700		—119,600	
—198,328		—136,275		19,900		—3,900	
1,847,052		1,535,503		2,417,100		2,148,200	
521,577	2,137,301	566,158	1,904,617	546,200	2,787,500	566,200	2,590,900
1,116,103		1,117,801		51,500		55,000	
339,487	1,455,590	73,903	1,191,704	20,100	71,600	9,400	64,400
—	458,060		324,974		184,600		154,700
	—177,359		—311,291		—654,200		—623,300
	62,077,147		62,021,548		63,004,500		65,356,300

---

‡ Estimated.

§ Rx. 174,000 Kachin, South Lushai, etc., Rx. 30,000 Gilgit (F. S. 1893-4, para. 63); Rx. 21,500 Kachin, South Lushai, etc., Rx. 48,150 Gilgit [Supplementary Grants] (F. S. 1894-5, para. 83).

¶ Rx. 202,500 Waziristan, etc., Rx. 40,000 other expeditions (F. S. 1895-6, paras. 155 and 200).

‖ Rx. 107,400 Waziristan, etc., Rx. 150,000 Chitral, Rx. 61,500 other expeditions (F. S. 1895-6, paras. 50, 155 and 200).

TABLE II.

ANNUAL INCREASE OR DECREASE IN NET EXPENDITURE

	1876–77.	1877–78.	1878–79.	1879–80.
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
I. Collection of Revenue:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	+579,550	—65,808	—863,153	+385,106
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	*+828*	*+1,591*	*+3,076*	*—1,470*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**+578,722**	**—67,399**	**—866,229**	**+386,576**
II. Debt Services:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	+260,935	+112,754	+148,932	—134,050
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	*+156,796*	*—9,036*	*+166,846*	*—7,025*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**+104,139**	**+121,790**	**—17,914**	**—127,025**
III. Civil Services:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	+298,882	—770,963	+464,442	—145,281
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	*+134,230*	*—32,410*	*+127,382*	*—37,629*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**+164,652**	**—738,553**	**+337,060**	**—107,652**
IV. Military Services:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	+728,389	+841,776	+568,936	+4,305,791
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	*+282,787*	*—12,990*	*+184,666*	*+13,605*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**+445,602**	**+854,766**	**+384,270**	**+4,292,186**
V. Commercial Services:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	—713,931	—1,231,177	+1,977,813	—1,185,742
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	*+303,786*	*—78,324*	*+287,180*	*—31,059*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**—1,017,717**	**—1,152,853**	**+1,690,633**	**—1,154,683**
VI. Special Services:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	+1,552,067	+3,214,753	—4,913,201	+1,461,463
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	*+22*	*+1,563*	*—1,522*	*+49,401*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**+1,552,045**	**+3,213,190**	**—4,911,679**	**+1,412,062**
VII. Special Defence:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	—	—	—	—
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	—	—	—	—
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	—	—	—	—
VIII. Provincial Surplus or Deficit:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	+309,621	+492,862	+347,603	—102,106
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	—	—	—	—
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**+309,621**	**+492,862**	**+347,603**	**—102,106**
GRAND TOTALS:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	+3,015,513	+2,594,197	—2,268,628	+4,585,181
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	*+878,449*	*—129,606*	*+767,628*	*—14,177*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**+2,137,064**	**+2,723,803**	**—3,036,256**	**+4,599,358**

OF BRITISH INDIA FOR THE 20 YEARS 1876-7 TO 1895-6.

1880-81.	1881-82.	1882-83.	1883-84.	1884-85.	1885-86.
Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
+94,725	+248,781	+216,405	—69,027	+1,254,895	+240,935
—1,389	*+821*	*+3,784*	*—3,008*	*+3,956*	*+5,681*
+96,114	**+247,960**	**+212,621**	**—66,019**	**+1,250,939**	**+235,254**
—917,478	+233,014	+120,104	—402,437	+239,340	—275,969
—106,434	*+72,325*	*+57,001*	*—11,363*	*+73,923*	*+135,408*
—811,044	**+160,689**	**+63,103**	**—391,074**	**+165,417**	**—411,377**
+667,482	+1,165,019	+341,701	+690,952	—342,971	+118,259
+21,907	*+8,364*	*+56,757*	*+17,470*	*+8,716*	*+163,905*
+645,575	**+1,156,655**	**+284,944**	**+673,482**	**—351,687**	**—45,646**
+2,668,804	—8,681,800	+1,158,065	+575,129	—1,073,005	+3,003,804
—567,466	*+55,487*	*+449,901*	*+395,624*	*—48,757*	*+234,163*
+3,236,270	**—8,737,287**	**+708,164**	**+179,505**	**—1,024,248**	**+2,769,641**
—408,965	—311,303	+1,093,489	—1,049,723	+759,340	—197,888
—34,629	*+69,755*	*+121,919*	*—15,279*	*+89,846*	*+466,356*
—374,336	**—381,058**	**+971,570**	**—1,034,444**	**+669,494**	**—664,244**
+561,702	—427,953	—103,646	—630,377	+465,340	+320,197
+91,610	*—66,115*	*—57,061*	*—17,914*	*—48*	—
+470,092	**—361,838**	**—46,585**	**—612,463**	**+465,388**	**+320,197**
—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—
—315,338	+1,221,831	—2,722,418	+737,947	+175,735	+812,826
—	—	—	—	—	—
—315,338	**+1,221,831**	**—2,722,418**	**+737,947**	**+175,735**	**+812,826**
+2,350,932	—6,552,411	+103,700	—147,536	+1,478,674	+4,022,164
—596,401	*+140,637*	*+632,301*	*+319,530*	*+127,636*	*+1,005,513*
+2,947,333	**—6,693,048**	**—528,601**	**—467,066**	**+1,351,038**	**+3,016,651**

Table II.—*continued.*

ANNUAL INCREASE OR DECREASE IN NET EXPENDITURE

	1886-87.	1887-88.	1888-89.	1889-90.
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
I. Collection of Revenue:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	—67,495	—317,478	+295,097	—840,602
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	+*194*	+*5,245*	—*86*	—*7,353*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**—67,689**	**—322,723**	**+295,183**	**—833,249**
II. Debt Services:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	+7,976	+1,055,344	—824,762	—502,675
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	+*199,384*	+*425,332*	—*210,794*	—*158,457*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**—191,408**	**+630,012**	**—613,968**	**—344,218**
III. Civil Services:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	+1,121,766	+312,412	+216,562	+143,679
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	+*203,701*	+*97,187*	+*70,892*	—*35,721*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**+918,065**	**+215,225**	**+145,670**	**+179,400**
IV. Military Services:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	—648,376	+1,135,473	—243,626	+522,911
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	+*229,040*	+*396,539*	+*237,418*	+*162,193*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**—877,416**	**+738,934**	**—481,044**	**+360,718**
V. Commercial Services:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	+186,114	+935,644	—88,718	—452,213
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	+*364,502*	+*295,306*	+*343,032*	—*116,469*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**—178,388**	**+640,338**	**—381,750**	**—335,744**
VI. Special Services:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	—1,639,958	—319,744	—71,616	+504,237
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	—	—	—	—
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**—1,639,958**	**—319,744**	**—71,616**	**+504,237**
VII. Special Defence:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	+325,626	+130,391	+333,578	—100,114
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	+*55,346*	—*30,232*	+*83,412*	—*18,994*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**+270,280**	**+160,623**	**+250,166**	**—81,120**
VIII. Provincial Surplus or Deficit:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	—488,217	+334,926	—85,473	+263,878
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	—	—	—	—
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**—488,217**	**+334,926**	**—85,473**	**+263,878**
GRAND TOTALS:				
Total Incr. (+) or Decr. (—)	—1,202,564	+3,266,968	—418,958	—460,899
Deduct Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) due to Exchange	+*1,052,167*	+*1,189,377*	+*523,874*	—*174,801*
Incr. (+) or Decr. (—) excluding Exchange	**—2,254,731**	**+2,077,591**	**—942,832**	**—286,098**

OF BRITISH INDIA FOR THE 20 YEARS 1876-7 TO 1895-6.

1890-91.	1891-92.	1892-93.	1893-94.	1894-95.	1895-96.
Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
+631,676	−7,543	−88,403	+405,151	+5,343	+1,340,900
−4,403	*+3,910*	*+4,972*	*+70,804*	*+69,799*	*+30,300*
+636,079	**−11,453**	**−93,375**	**+334,347**	**−64,456**	**+1,310,600**
−103,508	+171,479	+68,803	+66,346	+689,918	−950,400
−250,425	*+353,960*	*+328,640*	*+172,289*	*+552,091*	*+37,300*
+146,917	**−182,481**	**−259,837**	**−105,943**	**+137,827**	**−987,700**
+192,640	+1,308,616	+572,011	+404,723	+454,880	+793,500
−285,024	*+321,710*	*+553,907*	*+313,595*	*+715,290*	*+83,000*
+477,664	**+986,906**	**+18,104**	**+91,128**	**−260,410**	**+710,500**
+253,013	+1,583,857	+1,041,395	−168,231	+553,315	+1,370,600
−382,265	*+341,454*	*+1,176,695*	*+446,714*	*+1,284,020*	*+180,800*
+635,278	**+1,242,403**	**−135,300**	**−614,945**	**−730,705**	**+1,189,800**
−1,403,346	−159,469	+1,295,006	−232,684	+882,883	−196,600
−666,123	*+636,022*	*+1,022,698*	*+351,772*	*+1,128,381*	*+43,700*
−737,223	**−795,491**	**+272,308**	**−584,456**	**−245,498**	**−240,300**
−9,786	+836,364	+24,038	−263,886	−1,120,104	−7,200
—	*+750*	*+1,406*	*−2,005*	*+49*	*−200*
−9,786	**+835,614**	**+22,632**	**−261,881**	**−1,120,153**	**−7,000**
−197,644	+113,011	−146,788	−133,086	−140,374	−29,900
−30,563	*+31,906*	*−14,870*	*−10,649*	*−13,456*	*−13,400*
−167,081	**+81,105**	**−131,918**	**−122,437**	**−126,918**	**−16,500**
−747,623	−42,297	+63,565	−133,932	−342,909	+30,900
—	—	—	—	—	—
−747,623	**−42,297**	**+63,565**	**−133,932**	**−342,909**	**+30,900**
−1,384,578	+3,804,018	+2,829,627	−55,599	+982,952	+2,351,800
−1,618,803	*+1,689,712*	*+3,073,448*	*+1,342,520*	*+3,736,174*	*+361,500*
+234,225	**+2,114,306**	**−243,821**	**−1,398,119**	**−2,753,222**	**+1,990,300**

TABLE III.

NET EXPENDITURE OF BRITISH INDIA, 1875-6, 1884-5 AND 1895-6.

HEADS OF EXPENDITURE.	1875-6. 1.	1884-5. 2.	1895-6. (Budget Estimate.) 3.	Increase (+) or decrease (—) 1875-6 to 1884-5 (9 years). 4.	Increase (+) or decrease (—) 1884-5 to 1895-6 (11 years). 5.	Increase (+) or decrease (—) 1875-6 to 1895-6 (20 years). 6.
	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
I. Collection of Revenue:						
Total Expenditure	7,576,745	9,358,219	10,955,800	+1,781,474	+1,597,581	+3,379,055
Deduct Exchange	*4,748*	*12,507*	*192,000*	*+7,759*	*+179,493*	*+187,252*
Expenditure excluding Exchange	**7,571,997**	**9,345,712**	**10,763,800**	**+1,773,715**	**+1,418,088**	**+3,191,803**
II. Debt Services:						
Total Expenditure	4,246,734	3,907,848	3,310,400	—338,886	—597,448	—936,334
Deduct Exchange	*233,339*	*626,372*	*2,211,100*	*+393,033*	*+1,584,728*	*+1,977,761*
Expenditure excluding Exchange	**4,013,395**	**3,281,476**	**1,099,300**	**—731,919**	**—2,182,176**	**—2,914,095**
III. Civil Services:						
Total Expenditure	15,433,089	17,802,352	23,441,400	+2,369,263	+5,639,048	+8,008,311
Deduct Exchange	*230,171*	*534,958*	*2,737,400*	*+304,787*	*+2,202,442*	*+2,507,229*
Expenditure excluding Exchange	**15,202,918**	**17,267,394**	**20,704,000**	**+2,064,476**	**+3,436,606**	**+5,501,082**
IV. Military Services:						
Total Expenditure	15,965,780	17,057,865	25,462,000	+1,092,085	+8,404,135	+9,496,220
Deduct Exchange	*381,672*	*1,134,529*	*5,441,300*	*+752,857*	*+4,306,771*	*+5,059,628*
Expenditure excluding Exchange	**15,584,108**	**15,923,336**	**20,020,700**	**+339,228**	**+4,097,364**	**+4,436,592**
V. Commercial Services:						
Total Expenditure	3,042,370	1,972,171	2,590,900	—1,070,199	+618,729	—451,470
Deduct Exchange	*528,628*	*1,241,823*	*5,111,000*	*+713,195*	*+3,869,177*	*+4,582,372*
Expenditure excluding Exchange	**2,513,742**	**730,348**	**—2,520,100**	**—1,783,394**	**—3,250,448**	**—5,033,842**
VI. Special Services:						
Total Expenditure	631,710	1,811,858	64,400	+1,180,148	—1,747,458	—567,310
Deduct Exchange	*64*	—	—	*—64*	—	*—64*
Expenditure excluding Exchange	**631,646**	**1,811,858**	**64,400**	**+1,180,212**	**—1,747,458**	**—567,246**
VII. Special Defence:						
Total Expenditure	—	—	154,700	—	+154,700	+154,700
Deduct Exchange	—	—	*38,500*	—	*+38,500*	*+38,500*
Expenditure excluding Exchange	—	—	**116,200**	—	**+116,200**	**+116,200**
VIII. Provincial Surplus or Deficit:						
Total Expenditure	—434,681	—288,944	—623,300	+145,737	—334,356	—188,619
Deduct Exchange	—	—	—	—	—	—
Expenditure excluding Exchange	**—434,681**	**—288,944**	**—623,300**	**+145,737**	**—334,356**	**—188,619**
GRAND TOTALS:						
Total Expenditure	46,461,747	51,621,369	65,356,300	+5,159,622	+13,734,931	+18,894,553
Deduct Exchange	*1,378,622*	*3 550,189*	*15,731,300*	*+2,171,567*	*+12,181,111*	*+14,352,678*
Expenditure excluding Exchange	**45,083,125**	**48,071,180**	**49,625,000**	**+2,988,055**	**+1,553,820**	**+4,541,875**

TABLE IV.—Showing under certain specified heads the Increase (+) or Decrease (—), both in India and in England of the Net Expenditure of the Government of India in 1895-6 (*Budget Estimate*) as compared with 1875-6 (as shown in Table III.), classified as to, A, Civil and Military Expenditure, and, B, Othe Expenditure. Showing also the exact operation of Exchange in various forms in making up the total difference under these heads. [£=Rx.=Rs. 10.]

HEADS OF EXPENDITURE.	Increase or Decrease, excluding Exchange.		TOTAL Increase or Decrease, excluding Exchange. (Total of cols. 1 and 2.)	Increase in Cost of Exchange properly due to the fall in Exchange since 1875-6.	Increase due to (*a*) Exchange Compensation Allowance and (*b*) sterling pay of British troops.	Increase or Decrease due to Cost of Exchange on Increase of Sterling Charges.	TOTAL Increase or Decrease in any way due to Exchange. (Total of cols. 4, 5 and 6.)	TOTAL Increase or Decrease in Net Expenditure, as shown in Table III, col. 6. (Total of cols. 3 and 7.)
	INDIA.	ENGLAND.						
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
	Rx.	£	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx	Rx.	Rx.
A. CIVIL AND MILITARY:								
I. Collection of Revenue	+3,177,043	+14,760	+3,191,803	+31,252	(*a*)+143,700	+12,300	+187,252	+3,379,055
III. Civil Departments, Miscellaneous Charges, and Civil Works	+4,976,645	+524,437	+5,501,082	+1,516,699	(*a*)+553,500	+437,030	+2,507,229	+8,008,311
IV. Army Services and Military Works..................	+3,502,740	+933,852	+4,436,592	+2,515,018	(*a*)+610,000 (*b*)+1,156,400	+778,210	+5,059,628	+9,496,220
TOTAL CIVIL AND MILITARY	+11,656,428	+£1,473,049	+13,129,477	+4,062,969	+2,463,600	+1,227,540	+7,754,109	+20,883,586
B. OTHER EXPENDITURE:								
II. Debt Services	—3,442,280	+528,185	—2,914,095	+1,537,607	—	+440,154	+1,977,761	—936,334
V. Commercial Services..........	—6,173,312	+1,139,470	—5,033,842	+3,483,514	(*a*)+149,300	+949,558	+4,582,372	—451,470
VI. Special Services	—566,659	—587	—567,246	+425	—	—489	—64	—567,310
VII. Special Defence	+70,000	+46,200	+116,200	—	—	+38,500	+38,500	+154,700
VIII. Provincial Surplus or Provincial Deficit	—188,619	—	—188,619	—	—	—	—	—188,619
TOTAL OTHER EXPENDITURE	—10,300,870	+£1,713,268	—8,587,602	+5,021,546	+149,300	+1,427,723	+6,598,569	—1,989,033
GRAND TOTAL ..	+1,355,558	+£3,186,317	+4,541,875	+9,084,515	+2,612,900	+2,655,263	+14,352,678	+18,894,553

NOTE:—The total amount for Exchange Compensation Allowance in 1895-6, namely, Rx. 1,456,500, is taken from a Table given at para. 145 of the F. S. 1895-6. Its distribution among the heads of expenditure in this Table has been roughly estimated by reference to the Table above mentioned and more complete Tables given at paras. 75 and 113 of the F. S. 1894-5.

TABLE V.—Showing under certain specified heads the Increase (+) or Decrease (−) both in India and in England, of the Net Expenditure of the Government of India in 1884-5 as compared with 1875-6 (as shown in Table III.), classified as to, A, Civil and Military Expenditure, and, B, Other Expenditure. Showing also the exact operation of Exchange in various forms in making up the total difference under these heads. [£ = Rx. = Rs. 10.]

Heads of Expenditure.	Increase or Decrease, excluding Exchange.		Total Increase or Decrease, excluding Exchange. (Total of cols. 1 and 2.)	Increase in Cost of Exchange properly due to the fall in Exchange since 1875-6.	Increase due to (*a*) Exchange Compensation Allowance and (*b*) sterling pay of British troops.	Increase or Decrease due to Cost of Exchange on Increase of Sterling Charges.	Total Increase or Decrease in any way due to Exchange. (Total of cols. 4, 5 and 6.)	Total Increase or Decrease in Net Expenditure, as shown in Table III, col. 4. (Total of cols. 3 and 7.)
	India. 1.	England. 2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
	Rx.	£	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
A. Civil and Military:								
I. Collection of Revenue	+1,763,714	+10,001	+1,773,715	+5,329	—	+2,430	+7,759	+1,781,474
III. Civil Departments, Miscellaneous Charges, and Civil Works	+1,959,192	+105,284	+2,064,476	+279,203	—	+25,584	+304,787	+2,369,263
IV. Army Services and Military Works..................	−96,498	+435,726	+339,228	+462,976	(*b*) +184,000	+105,881	+752,857	+1,092,085
Total Civil and Military	+3,626,408	+£551,011	+4,177,419	+747,508	+184,000	+133,895	+1,065,403	+5,242,822
B. Other Expenditure:								
II. Debt Services	−1,184,549	+452,630	−731,919	+283,044	—	+109,989	+393,033	−338,886
V. Commercial Services	−2,079,417	+296,023	−1,783,394	+641,262	—	+71,933	+713,195	−1,070,199
VI. Special Services	+1,180,799	−587	+1,180,212	+78	—	−142	−64	+1,180,148
VII. Special Defence	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
VIII. Provincial Surplus or Provincial Deficit	+145,737	—	+145,737	—	—	—	—	+145,737
Total other Expenditure	−1,937,430	+£748,066	−1,189,364	+924,384	—	+181,780	+1,106,164	−83,200
GRAND TOTAL	+1,688,978	+£1,299,077	+2,988,055	+1,671,892	+184,000	+315,675	+2,171,567	+5,159,622

TABLE VI.—Showing under certain specified heads the Increase (+) or Decrease (—), both in India and in England, of the Net Expenditure of the Government of India in 1895-6 (*Budget Estimate*) as compared with 1884-5 (as shown in Table III.), classified as to, A, Civil and Military Expenditure, and, B, Other Expenditure. Showing also the exact operation of Exchange in various forms in making up the total difference under these heads. [£ = Rx. = Rs. 10.]

HEADS OF EXPENDITURE.	Increase or Decrease, excluding Exchange.		TOTAL Increase or Decrease, excluding Exchange. (Total of cols. 1 and 2.)	Increase in Cost of Exchange properly due to the fall in Exchange since 1884-5.	Increase due to (*a*) Exchange Compensation Allowance and (*b*) sterling pay of British troops.	Increase or Decrease due to Cost of Exchange on Increase of Sterling Charges.	TOTAL Increase or Decrease in any way due to Exchange. (Total of cols. 4, 5 and 6.)	TOTAL Increase or Decrease in Net Expenditure, as shown in Table III, col. 5. (Total of cols. 3 and 7.)
	INDIA. 1.	ENGLAND. 2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
	Rx.	£	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
A. CIVIL AND MILITARY:								
I. Collection of Revenue	+1,413,329	+4,759	+1,418,088	+31,827	(*a*) +143,700	+3,966	+179,493	+1,597,581
III. Civil Departments, Miscellaneous Charges, and Civil Works	+3,017,453	+419,153	+3,436,606	+1,299,648	(*a*) +553,500	+349,294	+2,202,442	+5,639,048
IV. Army Services and Military Works	+3,599,238	+498,126	+4,097,364	+2,309,266	(*a*) +610,000 (*b*) +972,400	+415,105	+4,306,771	+8,404,135
TOTAL CIVIL AND MILITARY	+8,030,020	+£922,038	+8,952,058	+3,640,741	+2,279,600	+768,365	+6,688,706	+15,640,764
B. OTHER EXPENDITURE:								
II. Debt Services	—2,257,731	+75,555	—2,182,176	+1,521,765	—	+62,963	+1,584,728	—597,448
V. Commercial Services	—4,093,895	+843,447	—3,250,448	+3,017,005	(*a*) +149,300	+702,872	+3,869,177	+618,729
VI. Special Services	—1,747,458	—	—1,747,458	—	—	—	—	—1,747,458
VII. Special Defence	+70,000	+46,200	116,200	—	—	+38,500	+38,500	+154,700
VIII. Change from Provincial Surplus to Deficit	—334,356	—	—334,356	—	—	—	—	—334,356
TOTAL OTHER EXPENDITURE	—8,363,440	+£965,202	—7,398,238	+4,538,770	+149,300	+804,335	+5,492,405	—1,905,833
GRAND TOTAL	—333,420	+£1,887,240	+1,553,820	+8,179,511	+2,428,900	+1,572,700	+12,181,111	+13,734,931

NOTE:—The total amount for Exchange Compensation Allowance in 1895-6, namely, Rx. 1,456,500, is taken from a Table given at para. 145 of the F. S. 1895-6. Its distribution among the heads of expenditure in this Table has been roughly estimated by reference to the Table above mentioned and more complete Tables given at paras. 75 and 113 of the F. S. 1894-5.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY A. BONNER,
34 BOUVERIE ST., E.C.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI. Supplement No. 6. SEPTEMBER, 1895.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from August 15th to 23rd.

Imperial Parliament.

August 15th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE FUTURE OF CHITRAL.

THE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

In the course of the debate on the Address, the question of the future of Chitral was referred to by

The Duke of MARLBOROUGH who, in his speech moving that a humble address of thanks be presented to her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen in reply to her Speech from the Throne, said that there was a matter which had not been thought worthy of special mention in her Majesty's gracious Speech, but no doubt their lordships had noticed with pleasure paragraphs in the daily press to the effect that a boundary line separating the British sphere of influence in the Pamirs from that of Russia was being demarcated. No doubt the solution of this old misunderstanding would remove the friction that had been so long the cause of some embarrassment to the Governments of both countries. Closely connected with this subject was Chitral, the recent scene of military operations, in which they had noticed with pride and natural pleasure the magnificent courage and skill displayed by the English forces in the face of overwhelming difficulties. (Cheers.) It was thought that the retention of British possession of Chitral might involve too heavy a strain upon the finances of India and upon the military resources of that country, already barely sufficient for the calls that they have to meet. Their lordships had learned with feelings of relief that a closer examination of the subject had convinced her Majesty's Ministers on the one hand of the impossibility of maintaining British influence in Chitral, unless a British agent were retained there, supported by an adequate British force, and, on the other hand, that the difficulties of insuring the safety of such a force and of providing a direct line of communication from Chitral to the frontiers of India, through the tribal countries lying to the south of Chitral, were not so difficult as at first anticipated. He thought it would have been a source of great regret to the inhabitants of the United Kingdom if it had been decided to precipitately abandon possessions won by such heroic efforts. (Hear, hear).

The Earl of ROSEBERY said: There is one topic which I regard as one of great importance which is not alluded to in the Speech from the Throne, but which, among other topics, has been touched on by the mover and the seconder of the Address. I mean the subject of the occupation of Chitral. I do not know even yet, even after the speeches of the mover and the seconder, whether we are to consider the announcements in the newspapers as authoritative with respect to the intentions of the Government. I most earnestly hope that they have not definitely made up their minds in the direction indicated in the newspapers. I am well aware in saying so that the Government of the Viceroy of India had arrived at substantially the same conclusion as that which is said to have been adopted by the noble marquis and his Government. But I am bound also to say that the late Government, who devoted a great deal of attention to that subject, and approached it without passion and prejudice, and without any affection for that policy which is usually called by the ribald name of "scuttle," had arrived unanimously at a directly opposite conclusion. I do not propose on this occasion to challenge an announcement which has not been made and a policy which, I hope, has been inaccurately reported. I shall wait for papers, which, I have no doubt, will be granted by the Government, and I will beg the Government, in giving those papers, that they shall be fully given, as copiously as they were by the late Cabinet, except in so far as their production would imperil points of Imperial policy: and especially I would ask that the opinions of Sir Donald Stewart—perhaps the highest living military Indian authority—should be given to Parliament in their full amplitude and without delay. While I do not wish to challenge this policy, I would desire to point out very briefly what were the main grounds which impelled the late Government to decide that Chitral should be evacuated at the discretion of the Viceroy and his Council. In the first place, the mountain barrier in which Chitral is situated is practically impervious to any large army if you leave it as it is. But if you construct roads southward of Chitral to lead to it you make pervious what was impervious, and in that way you add, not to the security but to the insecurity, of our Indian Empire. (Cheers.) In the next place, we have concluded the agreement with Russia respecting our Pamir boundary, which I think puts an entirely different complexion on any possible occupation of Chitral from what otherwise it might have had. It is possible and conceivable that had the boundary remained vague and open it might have been well to occupy Chitral, if only to prevent roaming parties of armed explorers from wandering within the limits which we consider to be our own. But that, owing to the conclusion of the Pamir agreement, is now impossible except as an act of war; and I am bound to say that I am not at all sure, since the conclusion of that agreement, the retention of a military post at Chitral is not likely to be considered by the Russian Government as something of a menacing measure which it may be necessary for them to counteract in a somewhat similar manner. Then there is the third argument, and it is an argument, to my mind, not without force. You are breaking faith with the people among whom your campaign has taken place. Do not believe that these mountain tribes because they are savage are unaware of the binding obligation of a declaration such as you have put forward. You went to Chitral declaring that you were going back as soon as you had accomplished your object. Let me read the words of your proclamation: "The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present and to prevent any future unlawful aggression on Chitral territory—('hear, hear,' from Lord Salisbury)—and as soon as this object has been attained the forces will be withdrawn." I confess I think that there must be overwhelming considerations which were not presented to the attention of Her Majesty's late advisers, to overrule a declaration so clear, so specific, and so honourable as that contained in the proclamation. There was a fourth reason. Surely if there is anything that we learn from the whole course of Indian history in late years it is this: What is wanted for our Indian empire is concentration, both financial and military. The policy shadowed out by the newspapers indicates an expenditure of some quarter of a million sterling a year. You know very well, if that be your policy, that it will not be met by anything like that sum. Now, what is the financial position of India? Is it in a condition, whatever your financial policy may be, to meet a large demand for military expenditure without an absolutely imperative call? I do not know what the financial policy of the new Government in India is going to be. There is a considerable number of their supporters who have come back pledged, as I understand, to vote against the reimposition of the cotton duties in India and to maintain the policy of a distinguished member of the new Government, whom I am sorry not to see in his place, but whom I congratulate on his inclusion in the new Cabinet, as well as upon his elevation to this House—I mean Lord James. Is the policy of Lord James the policy of the new Government? If that be so it will largely increase the financial difficulties of India and make the proposal I am criticising, but which I hope is not authoritative, much more difficult to defend. (Cheers.) But you are going to maintain a force of 11,000 men as we are told to protect your roads and to hold Chitral. Are you going to increase the Indian army by that number? If you are not going to increase the Indian army by that number it is clear that the Indian army up to this time has been considerably too large, and there will be a solid foundation for the many attacks made by native opinion on that subject. But if you are going to increase the army of India, which, in their opinion, was not excessive in its needs, you would be largely increasing the expenditure of that country, which is, as I think, already overweighted on that side of the account. On that point I trust that we shall have papers, and particularly some assurances with regard to the financial policy of the new Government in India. There is another point—namely, concentration—to which I think too little attention is paid in this country. This point is one which, I confess, had an overwhelming weight with myself, if there had been no other points; in deciding against the occupation of Chitral. You had in recent times, and up to recent times, only one great civilised military power coterminous with your Indian empire. That was enough to awaken panic in this country, to call forth great preparations, and to be the perpetual subject of scares in our press. You have now two great military powers coterminous or almost coterminous with your Indian empire. We have seen something lately in the press as to the advance of the French on the Mekong. I wish to say nothing that can in the remotest degree offend that great and friendly, and, may I add, somewhat sensitive power: but I may at least say this—France has not been inactive in the Valley of the Mekong or on the frontiers of Burma throughout the last three years, and her object in that activity has been the foundation of a great Eastern empire, which is to be coterminous with India. When you have a great military power coterminous on your north-east frontier, as another power is on the northern, it is not too much to say that the policy of financial and military concentration is more necessary for India than at any other period in her history; and it is on these grounds we came to the conclusion I have indicated, and, unless the papers show otherwise, it is on these grounds we should deprecate any such policy as that foreshadowed.

The Marquis of Salisbury said: The noble lord (Lord Rosebery) had in him the stirrings of a long and mighty oration, and I am afraid he felt the Speech was an inadequate pedestal on which to lift it up. (A laugh.) The noble lord's complaints were principally complaints of his own ignorance. He dwelt much upon his ignorance of what was our policy in Chitral, and he showed that ignorance by imputing to it features which it certainly does not possess. He blamed us for increasing the military expenditure of India. We do not intend to increase the military expenditure of India. He blamed us for increasing the military force that is at the command of the Indian Government. We have no intention of increasing the military force at the command of the Indian Government. He blamed us for breaking the language of the proclamation which one of Her Majesty's generals had made. We entirely deny that anything we have done or intend to do can, by the very harshest construction, be construed to break the promises into which we have entered. (Hear, hear.) On all these matters the noble lord was in error. I do not blame him, for he has had no means of information; but I should have thought, merely as a question of the economy of time, it would have been better to reserve his attack on the policy of the Government in Chitral until papers were laid on the Table which show what that policy has been. (Hear, hear.) I shall not attempt to extemporise a minute description of the measures which have been recommended by the Government of India or point out to what extent and in what respect they have been accepted and sanctioned by the Government at home. I imagine that papers will be very speedily in your lordships' hands which will show the precise boundaries and limits of our policy in that respect. I will only say this—that we held the abandonment of Chitral to be, if it was defensible as a question of physical strategy, most unwise as a question of moral strategy; and that it would have had, in our judgment, a detrimental effect upon the tribes which lie between the occupied ground and the outer frontiers of India, which would not have been without influence on the course of future events, and the development of future dangers, and which certainly were sufficiently serious to make us hesitate to adopt a policy of abandonment for which we found no sufficient argument in the papers that were left to us by our predecessors. (Hear, hear.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE FUTURE OF CHITRAL.

In the course of the debate on the Address,

Sir W. Harcourt said: This is a remarkable circumstance—there are foreign events of far greater importance than the annexation of Bechuanaland, to which events there is no reference whatever in the Speech from the Throne. (Cheers.) We all know perfectly well that there has been an expedition to Chitral. The questions whether as a result of that expedition the frontier of India is to be altered, whether Chitral is to be occupied permanently, or whether the troops having effected the object for which they originally went there are to be gradually withdrawn — these are questions upon which no information is offered. It has always been usual at the conclusion of an expedition like this, above all when it has been proposed to annex new territories, to extend the boundaries of the Empire, that Parliament should be given information in the Speech from the Throne. I do not desire to raise any question regarding which the Government may consider that it would be inexpedient that declarations should be made; but there have appeared in the press certain statements—I do not know whether they are authentic or not—upon this matter, and it is one upon which I think the House of Commons ought to be informed. (Hear, hear.) I therefore hope that the Government will tell us what is their policy with reference to the occupation of Chitral. Is it to be a permanent occupation or not? If it is to be a permanent occupation, what is the force which they expect will be required for that purpose; and this is most important—will that force for the occupation of Chitral involve an increase, a material increase, of the army of India? Are the Government going to make—as we know would be necessary in those circumstances—to make and maintain a new road through that territory? Can they give us any information as to the cost of such occupation and as to the means by which the Government of India will be able to meet that cost? The question of the ability of India to bear a burden of this character is a very serious question. We all know with reference to the expedition to Afghanistan that there was a large addition made some years ago to the Indian army, and that that addition to the army was among the elements which have led to the financial difficulties of India. Therefore, the House will naturally desire to know whether new burdens are likely to be put on India; also the character of those burdens, and what are the means by which she will be enabled to meet them. We had hoped that it might have been possible without injury to the public service for her Majesty's Government to make some statement upon so important a subject as that.

Mr. A. J. Balfour said: I pass from that subject [the atrocities in Armenia], on which the right hon. gentleman (Sir W. Harcourt) asked me no question, to another subject, not mentioned in the Queen's Speech, on which he took occasion to put a series of interrogatories. The right hon. gentleman was perfectly entitled to put them; but I think he will agree that the criticism he passed upon us for not having introduced into the Queen's Speech the negotiations with respect to the question of Chitral or our action with regard to it is not well founded. He led the House to suppose that the present Government, in carrying out the determination at which they have arrived not to recede from Chitral, have been extending the boundaries of the Empire, and he said that a step so important as extending the boundaries of the Empire ought not to be passed over in silence in the Queen's Speech. Well, Sir, I traverse the minor premiss of the right hon. gentleman. I do not admit that we have, in any accurate sense of the words, extended the boundaries of the Empire; and I think I can prove, from the action of the right hon. gentleman himself and his colleagues, that that is the case. For he will remember that the Secretary of State for India and the Government of India cannot use the troops of India beyond the boundaries of India without statutory permission. It is certain that the Government did use Indian troops in this territory of Chitral; so by their own action it follows that Chitral is within, and not without, the boundaries of that Empire. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman has asked us for a justification of what we admit is a reversal of what we believed was the policy which he and his friends intended to carry out. That my noble friend near me (Lord G. Hamilton) will be prepared to do should it prove to be necessary to deal with this subject more in detail than I propose to do. But I think I can furnish the right hon. gentleman and the House with adequate grounds for the course we have thought it our duty to pursue. Those gentlemen who have followed the question at all are aware that Chitral is a country lying at the base of the Hindu Kush mountains. Having conquered the range of the Hindu Kush, we have hitherto kept a British Resident at Gilghit and kept control over the policy of that country, that we have taken steps to exclude all possible foreign influence, and we have thought that that was a course required for the safety of India. But it must not be supposed that the case of Chitral can be considered in isolation; the case of Chitral can only be considered in connexion with the case of that part of the Kush country which adjoins Chitral, in which we have already a Resident and a force of troops. We have come to the conclusion, after consultation with the Government of India, that to retire from Chitral is not a course of action that can be carried out in isolation, and it would involve with it the abandonment of the existing post at Gilghit. That is not a policy which this House would contemplate with equanimity. Both at Gilghit and Chitral our troops have made their presence felt. Chitral indeed has been the scene of one of the most heroic actions which of recent years have rendered British arms illustrious. (Cheers.) But, putting aside all questions of strategy and all questions of foreign policy, it would be a serious blow to our prestige if, having once gone to those territories, we were to abandon them. All the tribesmen in that district know that there are two and only two great Powers they have to consider; they look to one or the other, and it may be, in certain cases have to balance between them. So far as those operations on our side of the Hindu Kush are concerned, we cannot permit of any such balancing; to us and to us alone must they look as a suzerain Power. If you put before them a great object-lesson—the British army, after having come forward, retreating—British administrators, after having been present, taking their departure, you will not only lose all means of controlling the foreign policy of these districts, but you will teach them a lesson which in the future may make them very reluctant to depend upon the British throne. There are questions of strategy as well as questions of politics involved; into these matters I am not competent to enter in detail; nor do I think it is an occasion on which the House of Commons would desire the topic to be raised. I will only say that in the judgment of all the eminent soldiers who have visited the locality, and I suspect in the opinion of almost all those who have considered the question, it would be a serious menace in the case of complications on our north-western frontier to have the passes of the Hindu Kush coming down to the Chitral territory not under the observation of a British authority, and to permit any lodgment of any foreign Power, whether political or military, upon our side of that great range of mountains. This is a brief outline of some of the general considerations which have induced us to feel it would be a serious blow to our position in the North-West frontier of India were we to abandon Chitral and Gilghit, which must be abandoned if Chitral is. But then come the difficulties suggested by the right hon. gentleman—namely, Will the retention of Chitral throw on the army or finances of India a burden which cannot be borne? Will they require a large augmentation of our army, or, above all, any increase in the taxation of India? Are there, in fact any considerations—allowing full weight to what I have said in favour of retaining Chitral—considerations of a financial and military character which render our abandonment of the district obligatory? Since the right hon. gentleman left office we have, of course, been in communication with the Government of India on the subject, and have received from them information—not at the disposal of right hon. gentlemen opposite when they came to the decision at which I believe they arrived—which leads us to believe no such serious burden as they seem to have anticipated will be thrown on India in consequence of the retention of those provinces or districts in the North-West. There will be no addition whatever to the Indian army. As I understand, the Indian Government inform us categorically that the existing body of troops in India will suffice to meet every necessity of the case arising out of the maintenance of our position in Chitral. The garrison force in Gilghit will be diminished; there will be a redistribution of troops, but no addition will be required in order to maintain the position which we desire to take up. As regards the road we have not, as far as I know, any precise estimate as to the cost of making it. But both as to the cost of making it and the possibility of inducing the tribes through which it passes to aid us in maintaining its security we have the most reassuring information from the Government of India. I therefore trust and believe that the House, having come into possession of facts with which our predecessors were not and could not be acquainted, will feel we have adopted the right course in determining to maintain, up to the very edge of our dominions, that control without which those dominions cannot be described as secure from every form of foreign interference. Papers will be laid down before the House before the end of next week, or, at any rate, before the Indian Budget.

Sir C. DILKE said that, with regard to Chitral, he gathered from the speech of the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Balfour) that the Government were acting on the advice of the Government of India. He did not know whether the latter Government were unanimous or whether any dissent had been recorded.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Government of India is absolutely unanimous. (Hear.)

Sir C. DILKE said that that would carry his vote on the subject. It seemed to him that on a matter of this kind Ministers here could not possibly have the knowledge possessed by the Government of India, and, seeing that that Government was absolutely unanimous, it was the duty of hon. members to accept their view and to assist to carry it into effect. (Hear, hear.)

August 19*th.*

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE OCCUPATION OF CHITRAL.

Mr. W. J. GALLOWAY asked the Secretary for India whether the troops now in Chitral were to form a permanent force of occupation; if not, which regiments were to be withdrawn: and whether he could state an approximate date when such withdrawal would take place.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: There will be a permanent force in Chitral territory consisting of two native infantry regiments, two guns of a mountain battery, and one company of sappers. What particular regiments will be selected I cannot say, but the Government of India, I understand, propose to withdraw the Pioneer battalion now there. Thus the addition to the force in the whole Gilghit Agency will be one regiment, one company of sappers, and one mountain battery. The withdrawal of the Pioneer regiment will take place as soon as the necessary arrangements can be made. (Hear, hear.)

Sir W. WEDDERBURN subsequently asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in accordance with section 54 of the

Government of India Act of 1858, the fact that orders were sent directing the actual commencement of hostilities beyond the external frontiers of India was, as regarded the Chitral expedition, communicated to both Houses of Parliament within three months after the sending of such order; and, if not, why this had not been done.

Lord G. Hamilton: No communication under the Act has been made to Parliament as regards Chitral. The orders sent for the advance of a force to relieve the political agent in Chitral have not been held to be of a nature to fall within the provisions of section 54. An examination of the precedents shows that the section has never been held to apply to cases such as the present, where the operations have been carried on with frontier tribes, and not with an organised Power beyond Her Majesty's Indian Protectorate. The only cases in which the consent of Parliament has been asked since the Act of 1858 was passed are those when hostilities were carried on in Abyssinia, Afghanistan, Egypt, and Burma. As the House has already been informed by the right hon. the First Lord of the Treasury, papers relating to the Chitral expedition, including the most recent instructions, will be laid on the Table of the House as early as possible.

Sir W. Wedderburn asked the Secretary of State for India, with reference to the earlier portion of his answer, whether it was held that Chitral was not beyond the external frontiers of India.

Lord George Hamilton was understood to reply that it was so held.

Sir H. Fowler asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether the papers relating to Chitral would be laid on the Table before the Indian Budget was introduced.

Mr. Balfour replied in the affirmative, but added that he did not think the Indian Budget should be taken until Supply was finished, and he hoped that would not take very long.

THE DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY IN CHITRAL.

SIR W. WEDDERBURN'S AMENDMENT CLOSURED.

In the course of the debate on the Address, the division having been taken shortly after midnight upon Mr. Pickersgill's amendment,

Mr. Balfour said he hoped that, in view of the fact that important papers had not yet been presented, that the late Secretary for India had left the House, and that it was well the debate on the Address should be finished to-night, the hon. member (Sir William Wedderburn) who had an amendment on the paper relating to affairs in Chitral would postpone his amendment till a more convenient season.

Sir W. Harcourt said that until they were in possession of the further communications on this subject it would be impossible to come to a decided opinion. In the absence of the further papers and of the late Secretary for India, who had left the House under the impression that questions relating to Chitral would not be raised to-night, he trusted that the suggestion of the Leader of the House would be agreed to.

Mr. T. M. Healy said the First Lord of the Treasury had just made an important communication to the House. The right hon. gentleman had said that the late Secretary of State for India had left the House. That pointed to the fact of the lateness of the sitting. No one knew better than he did that the First Lord of the Treasury was always most anxious to study the general convenience of the members, but the hon. member, who was anxious to move this motion was in this position: The Government had said important papers were going to be laid on the Table. No one was qualified to speak on the question with greater experience than his hon. friend the member for Banffshire. His hon. friend proposed to raise it on the present information. He was anxious to move it in regard to the present position of his mind. The Government, however, were anxious to improve his mind by the presentation of other papers. He would, therefore, ask whether in the event of the hon. baronet giving way on his motion to-night, the Government were prepared to say, first, when the papers would be presented, and, secondly, whether they were prepared to give a day for the discussion of the subject. In order to give the First Lord an opportunity to reply he moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Balfour: My noble friend the Secretary for India informs me that he hopes all the papers will be laid on the Table, and circulated before the end of the week. Whether it would be proper to give a day in addition to the day on the Indian Budget to discuss the view of hon. gentlemen opposite, I can hardly say until I know what view they take of the papers, except they desire to move a vote of censure, in which case, of course, we shall give a day. But, in the absence of any such view, I cannot help thinking that the Indian Budget which cannot now be long delayed, will afford a full opportunity for the discussion of this matter.

Sir W. Wedderburn said that he could only express his regret that he felt it his duty, however feeble his voice might be, to raise the question. Amid all the varying and powerful interests struggling for precedence in the House, he felt that he should be wrong in abandoning this real chance of discussing the interests of India. (Cheers.)

Mr. Dalziel hoped that the Leader of the House would now recognise (Ministerial cries of "Oh;") the force of the Motion for adjournment. He must see that this was not a frivolous attempt to keep the House sitting or to raise a question of secondary importance. The hon. gentleman in charge of the Chitral amendment said that he regarded the question as of supreme and vital importance. The hon. member assured the the House that he had a speech which would occupy an hour at least in delivery (laughter) and the hon. member for Flintshire was also prepared to speak for a considerable length of time. Therefore, he hoped the Government would at once do what they might have to do in any case at a later stage of the Debate—consent to the adjournment. (Opposition cheers.)

Mr. Balfour: I move "That the question be now put."

The Speaker, accepting the closure, "the question is, that the question be now put."

Mr. Dalziel: I rise to a point of order.

The Speaker: There can be no point of order.

Mr. Balfour rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the question be now put."

The House divided and the numbers were:—

For the closure	206
Against	73
Majority ..	133

The House divided on the question that the debate be adjourned. The numbers were:—

For the adjournment	69
Against	212
Majority ..	143

Mr. Balfour: I beg to move "That the main question be now put." (Loud cheers.)

Mr. Speaker then put the question that the House do agree with the Address in answer to the Queen's Speech.

Mr. T. M. Healy, sitting with his hat on, spoke to a point of order, submitting that the question of the Closure should be put in the first instance before the main question was put.

The Speaker: The practice I have followed is the usual practice. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. T. M. Healy said that he desired to raise the point of order that the House must first divide upon the question of the Closure before it divided upon the main question.

The Speaker said that, of course, if the hon. gentleman wished to raise a fresh point of order he could listen to him.

Mr. T. M. Healy: The original question upon which the Closure was moved was not a question dependent before the House. It was a question of adjournment. It was upon a question of adjournment that the Closure was moved, and that constitutes a distinction.

The Speaker: The Closure was moved upon the adjournment. Thereupon that question was put to the House and was disposed of. After that, the right hon. gentleman claimed, as he was entitled to do, that the question which was before the House before the Motion of adjournment was moved should be put to the House. Conceiving it to be entirely in order, I proceeded to put it. I may say that I should read the rule as the hon. and learned member has read it, but I should feel some hesitation in acting, in any event, contrary to the course which has been followed since I have been a Member of the House. (Ministerial cheers.)

The House divided on the main question, the Motion for an Address, and the numbers were :—

For the Motion	217
Against	63
Majority ..	154

The Address was therefore agreed to.

August 22nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE COST OF NASRULLA KHAN'S VISIT.

Sir **Andrew Scoble** asked the Secretary of State for India whether it was still the intention of Her Majesty's Government that the expenses of the visit to Europe of His Highness Nasrulla Khan should be paid out of the revenues of India.

Lord G. **Hamilton**: Her Majesty's Government propose to make no change in the manner in which the late Government decided that the expenses of his Highness's visit should be defrayed.

THE PAY OF INDIAN SOLDIERS AND CARRIERS.

Sir E. **Ashmead-Bartlett** asked the Secretary for India what was the monthly pay of the Indian soldiers and carriers who were stated to have received 15 rupees (16s. 4d.) as a reward for conspicuous gallantry and devotion during the Chitral campaign; and whether her Majesty's Government proposed to increase these rewards.

Lord G. **Hamilton**: According to the general orders issued by the Government of India, certain carriers attached to the 14th Bengal Infantry Regiment will receive as a reward three months' pay; but I am not able to state accurately what is the amount of their pay. The matter is one which her Majesty's Government must leave to the discretion of the Government of India.

Sir E. **Ashmead-Bartlett** said that he understood that that was the amount of the reward that was offered to some of the soldiers.

Lord G. **Hamilton**: No. I understand that three months' pay was given as a reward to certain soldiers, and that some ingenious gentleman has calculated the amount of the reward according to the rate of pay. (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

THE KYTHAL CORRESPONDENCE.

On the motion of Mr. H. **Kimber**, an Address was granted for "Return of correspondence between the Governor-General of India and the Honourable the Court of Directors or other home authorities, and of such reports of the agents of the Cis-Sutlej States and local authorities relating to the succession of the chiefs of Kythal from the death of Bhai Lal Singh in 1819 to the death of Bhai Golab Singh in 1845, and of such memorials of Bhai Golab Singh; and of the guardians of his son, Bhai Jasmair Singh, and of Bhai Jasmair Singh himself, as are in the possession of the India Office, together with the correspondence relating thereto":

"And of copy of a petition recently presented to this House by 1,042 persons, being zemindars and other inhabitants of Kythal and other towns and villages in the Cis-Sutlej territory of the Punjab, praying for inquiry."

August 23rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

CRIMEAN AND INDIAN COMPASSIONATE ALLOWANCES.

Sir J. **Leng** asked the Secretary to the Treasury whether a minute had been issued recently modifying the conditions under which compassionate allowances were given to soldiers who served in the Crimean and Indian Mutiny campaigns, and, if so, would he state its purport.

Mr. **Hanbury**: No Treasury minute has been issued on this subject. It has recently been arranged, however, by the Treasury and War Office that all qualified candidates who are sixty-five years of age, or who being under that age, are certified as totally incapacitated by permanent bodily infirmity from earning a livelihood, may at once be granted campaign pensions.

INDIAN STAFF CORPS OFFICERS.

Mr. **Henniker Heaton** asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had any objection to lay upon the Table of the House the recommendations made by the Government of India in order to prevent the supersession of Staff Corps officers by those in the Line:

Would he explain why certain officers of the Staff Corps, who entered the army as sub-lieutenants, were denied the privilege accorded to all others of counting service out of India before joining the Staff Corps to an extent not exceeding two years, although the duties performed by these sub-lieutenants were identical with those performed by other officers of that rank who had been allowed to count all their service from date of first commission, and although all the officers who entered the Staff Corps from the Royal Marines had been granted the above-mentioned privilege:

And whether he was prepared to consider the advisability of allowing every officer to count towards pension all his service out of India before joining the Staff Corps, to an extent not exceeding two years.

Lord G. **Hamilton**: I have no objection to lay upon the Table of the House the papers regarding the supersession of Staff Corps officers by those of the Line. As regards the second part of my hon. friend's question, I may explain that although officers who join the Staff Corps from British regiments are allowed to reckon two years' service out of India for Indian pension, such service, being out of India, is governed by the rules of the War Office. The service of the officers to whom my hon. friend refers was service on a temporary commission, which, under War Office rules, does not reckon for pension. I see no reason for altering the rules on this subject.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, M.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.]

[OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VI. Supplement No. 7. OCTOBER, 1895.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from August 23rd to September 4th.

Imperial Parliament.

August 23rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN COTTON DUTIES.

Mr. C. E. **Schwann** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the opposition to the continuance of the Indian Cotton Duties expressed in Lancashire during the recent electoral contest, it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to suggest to the Government of India, or whether the Indian Government was itself prepared, to abolish those duties, and to find alternative methods of taxation or economies in official salaries and expenditure generally to meet the deficit at present existing in the finances of our great Eastern dependency, and to meet the probable increased deficit which would arise when the outlay on the Chitral Expedition had to be paid for, and would be further increased by an annual charge for the maintenance of a military station in the Chitral district?

Lord **George Hamilton**: The hon. Member raises a series of controversial questions as to the Ways and Means of the Indian Government, to which it is impossible to reply adequately within the compass of an answer to a Parliamentary Question. If he will be good enough to raise them on the Indian Budget, I shall then be able to deal fully with them.

August 26th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN COTTON DUTIES.

Mr. **Philip Stanhope**, rising amid cheers, asked the Secretary of State whether, in view of the statement made by him in the House of Commons on the 21st of February last, and which he then announced was also acquiesced in by Lord Salisbury, as to the impolicy of imposing cotton duties upon English goods in India, the Government proposed to take steps for the repeal of those duties; and whether the Government, as a preliminary to their repeal, would call upon the Government of India to impose a general and equivalent Excise Duty upon all qualities of cotton cloth manufactured in India, in order to render those Duties absolutely non-protective in their character?

Lord **George Hamilton**: I have received a Memorial from the representatives of the various cotton industries in Lancashire stating fully and clearly their objections to the present Excise Duty levied on cotton yarns in India, and pointing out that in their opinion such a duty does not remove or counterbalance the protective character of the Customs Duty to which all imported cotton goods are subject. This Memorial will be sent to India, and the Indian Government requested to state their side of the case. I may add that I adhere to the speech I made on the 21st of February last, and have nothing to retract in connexion with it. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. **Stanhope**: May I ask the noble Lord whether, as he adheres to his speech of the 21st February, the Government of which he is so important a Member will take steps to repeal these duties? (Hear, hear.)

Lord G. **Hamilton**: I think that my hon. friend had better read my speech first. What I then stated was that the objection to the imposition of the duties was much more serious than the majority of the House believed; and I further stated that there was great difficulty in framing a satisfactory Excise Duty to counterbalance a Customs Duty. To both those opinions I adhere.

Mr. **Stanhope** asked whether the noble Lord would be able to give any more definite answer to the inquiry than he now afforded to the House on the occasion of the Debate to be raised on this subject on the Indian Budget?

Lord G. **Hamilton**: My hon. friend will see that this is a matter of some difficulty and of great delicacy, and I certainly ought not to be expected to give any opinion on the question until the Indian Government have had an opportunity of fully stating their views on the subject. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. **Flynn** asked whether it was not the fact that a large number of Lancashire Conservative members were returned at the last Election on the strength of pledges that the Cotton Duties would be repealed? (Opposition cheers.)

The **Speaker**: Order, order. That is a matter of opinion. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. **Gibson Bowles** asked whether the opinion of the Indian Government had not been previously stated on this question, and whether the opinion now asked for was to be based upon any new facts?

Lord G. **Hamilton**: The whole statement is new, because the Excise Duty only recently came into operation, and until some time has elapsed it will be impossible to say exactly what the effect of that Duty will be.

Sir W. **Wedderburn**: Is the noble Lord now able to tell us more precisely the date on which the Indian Budget will be taken?

Lord G. **Hamilton**: I am afraid that that does not depend upon me, but upon the hon. gentleman and his friends. (Ministerial cheers.) The Indian Budget will be taken when we get through Supply.

August 27th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN COTTON DUTIES.

Mr. T. R. **Buchanan** asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the decided expression of opinion of the House of Commons on 21st February on the subject of the

Indian Cotton Duties, he would promise that the Duties should not be repealed until the House had again had an opportunity of expressing its opinion on the subject?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The hon. gentleman may rest assured that nothing in connexion with these Duties will be done hastily or surreptitiously. The vote given on the 21st of February last may fairly be interpreted as giving a sanction to the imposition of these Duties; but that approval was obtained on a distinct undertaking from the then Secretary of State for India that the Duties should in no sense whatever be of a protective character. Since that Debate the Duties in Burma on yarns of 20 and under have been reduced by the executive action of the Government of India from 5 per cent. to ½ per cent., as they were found to be protective in their operation.

Mr. W. E. M. TOMLINSON asked whether it was not a fact that the expression of the House of Commons would not, in practice, preclude the Indian Government from making the change if they found that the Exchequer required it?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Indian Government unquestionably have power to deal with it.

INDIAN PRISON-MADE GOODS.

Mr. T. LOUGH asked the Secretary of State for India whether a remonstrance had been addressed by the Government to Foreign Powers against the practice of sending brushes and other articles made in prisons to this country; whether there was a considerable manufacture of carpets in prisons in India, and whether this manufacture was fostered and encouraged by the Government, and what the annual value of the carpets so made was; whether these carpets were freely exported to European countries; and whether it was the intention of the Government to suppress this competition with free labour in this important Trade?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The manufacture of carpets in prisons in India has for some years past been sanctioned by the Government of India, but there are no statistics to show to what extent the manufacture is now carried on, what the value of the carpets so made is, or the number exported to European countries. An inquiry can be made of the Government of India on these points if the hon. gentleman wishes it. In 1885 the Secretary of State sent instructions to the Government of India that gaol manufactures should, as far as possible, be confined to articles adapted for use by other public departments; but he added—"It is not, of course, intended to preclude gaols from special industries, such as carpet-making, which have been found suitable as a means of employing convict labour, but for which there is practically no market in the department of Government." (Hear, hear.)

Mr. LOUGH asked whether the noble Lord would kindly mention one or two of the other articles still made in Indian gaols and exported to foreign countries, and would furnish a return on the subject?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said that, if the hon. gentleman would specify the articles with respect to which he desired information, he would make inquiries and see whether he could furnish the return asked for. (Hear, hear.)

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS.

Petitions praying that effect might be given to the resolution of the House of Commons in favour of holding open competitive examinations to the Indian Civil Service simultaneously in India and in England were presented by Sir W. Wedderburn from the inhabitants of Cocanada (two), Hospet, Jaganadhapuram, and Madura (three).

August 30th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

Mr. J. H. DALZIEL asked the First Lord of the Treasury, assuming that the Report of Supply was finished on Monday (Sept. 2nd), when the Indian Budget would be taken?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: If the Report of Supply is finished on Monday (Sept. 2nd), the discussion on the Indian Budget will be taken after the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, which will be on Tuesday (Sept. 3rd).

September 2nd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

INDIAN RAILWAYS.

Mr. R. G. WEBSTER asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it was a fact that guaranteed and assisted railways in India had been constructed at a less cost than those built by the State; and if the Government would consider the question whether, in the event of future railway construction in Africa, it would be desirable to give a guarantee to such lines of railway as they might deem desirable to develop British territory in Africa and British commerce?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I learn, on enquiry, that, speaking generally, from the results of recent experience, there is no substantial difference in the cost of construction of State railways in India and of those built by guaranteed or assisted companies. As regards questions which will have to be dealt with in my Department of future railway construction in Africa, I can only say that each scheme will be considered on its merits, and settled according to the particular circumstances of the case.

September 3rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EXCHANGE COMPENSATION ALLOWANCE.

Mr. E. J. C. MORTON asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the original orders pursuant to which what was known as exchange compensation allowance had been granted to Indian officers, civil and military; whether he would lay upon the Table of the House a statement of all sums disbursed and estimated under the head up to the present time; whether he was aware that such disbursements and estimates had been made avowedly for expenditure in England; and, whether the cost of them would be borne in whole or in part by the British Treasury?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The original orders, which were contained in a published Resolution of the Government of India, dated 18th of August, 1893, will be given if the hon. member will move for them. I may refer to page 216 of the Finance Accounts for 1893-4, and paragraphs 108 and 145 of the Financial Statement for 1895-6, both of which are on the Table of the House. The allowance is not given "avowedly for expenditure in England," but to enable officers to meet such expenditure if they think fit. No part of the cost will be borne by the British Treasury.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY IN CHITRAL.

SPEECH BY SIR H. FOWLER.

On the motion for going into Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts,

Sir HENRY FOWLER rose to call attention to the decision recently arrived at by Her Majesty's Government as to the occupation of Chitral. He said: I am sorry that I have to intervene at the present period of the Session with reference to the policy of the late Government and of the present Government in connection with recent events at Chitral. But it would not have been practicable to discuss this question at an earlier date. It would not have been practicable on the Address, for the obvious reason that, in the absence of the papers which have only been laid on the Table in the course of the last few days, I neither could have defended the policy of the late Government nor ventured upon any criticism of the action of the present Government. Although we must regret that so important a Debate as this should take place at so late a period of the Session, yet, owing to no fault of the late or the present Government, the Debate could not have taken place at an earlier date. It will be necessary for me to state very briefly the past relations of Chitral and of British India, not only to correct certain misconceptions which have found expression in this House and in the Press—I refer specially to a statement of the First Lord of the Treasury, who said at the commencement of the Session that Chitral was within and not without the boundaries of the Indian Empire, an allegation which I shall have to traverse in a very few minutes—but it is also necessary to state the history of those relations in order that we may understand the position of affairs that led to the recent expedition, and the reasons which induced the late Government to adopt the policy to which the Government objects. In the first place, I must remind the House that the word "Chitral" is used in two senses. There is Chitral the State and there is Chitral the capital of that State, and that causes some confusion from time to time, both in reading the papers which have been presented and in discussing these affairs. The State of Chitral is, speaking roughly, considerably larger than Wales. It occupies something like 9,000 square miles. It lies in the midst of a vast mountainous region, which is closed in for six or eight months in the year by inaccessible and impassable passes. It contains a population of between 80,000 and 100,000, and its extreme length at one point is upwards of 200 miles. Now the capital of this State, the fort of Chitral, which was the scene of the splendid defence which caused the admiration of all Englishmen—(Cheers)—is situated, together with some half-a-dozen scattered villages, in a narrow valley about one mile and a-half broad and six miles long, containing a population, all told, of about 4,000. Our connection with the State arose through our connection with the State of Kashmir. It is a very shadowy connection, which is very difficult to trace till we get within very recent times. At all events, in 1846, the State of Kashmir passed into British hands. Part of the arrangements then made—and they are arrangements which I deeply regret—was the sale by the British Government, to the Maharaja of Kashmir, of Kashmir and all its adjacent territory, and a sum was paid by him to the East India Company of £750,000. For 30 years there was very little intercourse between this country and Kashmir, and certainly very little intercourse between Kashmir and Chitral. The old ruler of Chitral, who ruled it for 30 years, and whose death was the commencement of much of the recent trouble, was always fighting for his independence against the Amír of Afghanistan on the one side and against the Maharaja of Kashmir on the other. But in 1876, as the House will see from the despatches in the Blue Book, proposals were made to Lord Lytton with reference to the reconstruction of the arrangements then existing between the Indian Government and the Government of Kashmir, and also with reference to the relations between Kashmir and Chitral. In the correspondence it will be found that Lord Lytton, in reporting to the Secretary of State the interviews which had taken place with reference to these transactions, stated that one of the terms of the negotiations between himself and the Maharaja of Kashmir was that an English officer should be appointed to reside permanently in Gilghit for the purpose of obtaining information as to the progress of events beyond the Kashmir frontier. The House has before it the various stages of these negotiations. The result amounts to this—that a Treaty was concluded between the British Government and Kashmir, and that a Treaty was also concluded between Kashmir and Chitral, under which Chitral submitted to the suzerainty of Kashmir in exchange for a subsidy. That is the beginning of the influence that Kashmir had over Chitral. The experiment was tried of the presence of a resident in Gilghit. That is the extreme outpost of our frontier in Western India, and it lies on the north-eastern frontier of Kashmir. It is inaccessible for a great portion of the year, and was selected as the most convenient outpost on our western frontier in that part of India. Major Biddulph was the first agent who went to Gilghit, and I think he went either in 1877 or 1878. The arrangement was very unsatisfactory, and in December, 1880, the Government of India submitted to the notice of the then Secretary of State (Lord Hartington) the very unfortunate state of things which had arisen in that neighbourhood. In July, 1881, the Government of India determined to discontinue this agent at Gilghit. In their despatch to the Home Government they explained the difficulties that had arisen, and that there had been an attempt to take Gilghit by force, and they said:—"Under these circumstances it appeared to us that the British Agency at Gilghit could only be kept up at the expense of embarrassment and anxieties altogether disproportionate to the advantages which could be expected to result from its maintenance. We therefore decided to withdraw it." In the correspondence attention was also drawn to the request which the Mehtar or ruler of Chitral had made that he might enter into direct alliance with the British Government. Lord Hartington approved of the decision at which the Indian Government had arrived, pointing out that the appointment of an agent at Gilghit appeared from the first to have been distasteful to the Maharaja of Kashmir, and had failed to realise the expectations with which it was made in 1877. He added, however, that he realised the importance of keeping a watch upon events on that part of the frontier, and it was clearly understood, both by the English Government and the Indian Government, that the action taken was liable to reconsideration if either Government should think fit to reverse it. From that time until 1885 there was no question of a British Resident at Gilghit, but in that year Sir William Lockhart was sent on a general mission to the north-west of Kashmir, and he made a very elaborate and interesting report upon the results of that mission. That report could easily have been condensed, and its most interesting features might have been embodied in this Blue-book with great advantage. I cannot but regret the meagreness of the information supplied in the Blue-book, for the insufficiency of the information places the House at a disadvantage in approaching the consideration of the action of the late Government and of the present Government. It would have been well to have had before us the actual reports and opinions of the various distinguished officers of the Indian Government who have been mixed up from time to time in these affairs. Well, Colonel Lockhart, as he was then, after he had described the physical aspects both of Gilghit and Chitral, stated that in his opinion the acquisition of Gilghit would insure the safety of the Hindu-kush. He said the only danger to be anticipated on the Hindu-kush frontier could be met if the Indian Government were to acquire Gilghit. The House will see that, in the whole course of this matter, the prime danger has always been the danger which might arise on the Hindu-kush. That danger, no doubt, was present to Lord Lytton's mind in 1876, and was present to Lord Dufferin's mind in 1885. It was in reference to that a special mission was sent, and the result of that inquiry was the deliberate opinion expressed by Colonel Lockhart that that danger would be met if the British Government acquired Gilghit, and he suggested the establishment of an agency there. The particulars of his proposals are to be found on page 7 of the Blue-book:—"Having very fully considered the matter, we decided in the autumn of 1887 that some measures ought to be taken to effect our object without much further delay. Colonel Lockhart, who visited the country in 1885, had submitted, in 1886, proposals for holding it, but these proposals seems to us to involve unnecessarily large expenditure. We therefore sent up an officer of the Quarter-master-General's Department, Captain Durand, with orders to work out a plan on a more moderate scale. The idea was to establish in Gilghit an English agency backed by a sufficient number of the reorganised troops which Kashmir would furnish under the scheme for the utilisation of the native armies. The number of English officers was to be as small as possible, and the expenditure to be cut down to the lowest limit. The objects in view were the watching and control of the country lying to the south of the Hindu-kush, and the organisation of a force which would be able in time of trouble to prevent any *coup de main* by a small body of troops acting across the passes. Captain Durand spent the summer in visiting Chitral and other points of interest and was very well received. His proposals were briefly that the British Agency at Gilghit should consist of four officers, namely, the officer in charge, two junior officers of infantry and artillery and a doctor. The force would consist of 1,200 regular infantry, 100 garrison ar- tillery, a battery of screw guns and 500 irregular troops. This force would be under the control of the English officer in charge, not of the Kashmir Governor. The telegraph line would be completed to Gilghit and roads opened. Certain increased subsidies would be granted to the neighbouring chiefs; the Mehtar of Chitral would be presented with a battery of guns and 1,000 sniders, and in course of time a con- siderable force of Chitralis would be organised and armed." The Indian Government, however, were of opinion that these proposals might be somewhat modified, but I need not trouble the House with the modifications suggested by them. In the dispatch from which I am quoting we have the first mention in any official paper of what has now become a very vital question in the consideration of our situation in that part of the world. "It is not easy to overcome the fears and prejudices of the Swat and Bajaur with regard to this point, but we have some reason to hope that, in the course of time, we may succeed in doing so. The Khans of Dir and Jandol, who command the greater part of the road, both seem likely in the end to prove tractable, and even now a regular postal road could be established." The proposals thus made were approved of by Lord Cross in 1889. He added that the opening of a direct route to Chitral was an important feature in connection with the scheme, and that he trusted that the tribes whose country would be traversed would be induced to co-operate in the execution of the work. The scheme was carried out and an Agency was established. The first Agent was Lieutenant-Colonel Durand, and he seems to have gone there somewhere in the middle of 1889. The Indian Government gave him very full instructions. The general lines on which he was to proceed were fully set out. He was instructed to go to Chitral and set on foot the new arrangement. Lieutenant-Colonel Durand went, and in 1889 we have his Report, to which I draw the attention of the House. The House will remember that one of the conditions to which the Government attached importance was the opening up of this road from Peshawar to Chitral. Captain Durand says:—"As to the first stipulation, it is more than doubtful if he is sincere in his professions. He has undoubtedly written to the Chiefs whose territories lie between our borders and those of Chitral, urging them to comply with the wishes of the Government, but, at the same time, he has sent verbal messages advising them to object to the road being open to the passage of troops." That, I believe, has been the policy all the way through, that, I believe, will be the policy in the future, and I believe that one of the sources of the greatest danger in reference to this route is the deep-rooted and insurmountable objections of the tribes and people who live in that locality to the construction of this road—not only the residents of Chitral, but the residents in the country through which the road would have to pass if ever it was made. Well, the Mehtar expressed his willingness to do everything that the Government asked him to do in connection with the construction of this road, while privately he was using his influence, and very successfully, with the Chiefs to prevent it. The House will remember that there was no proposal at that time for any Resident in Chitral, and no proposal for a Resident outside Gilghit. The Resident at Gilghit was to visit Chitral from time to time, but I repeat that up to that time there was no proposal to put any one in residence at Chitral. In 1891 the old Mehtar applied for an increased subsidy. He wanted his Rx. 6,000 turned into Rx. 12,000. The Government of India recommended that the subsidy should be doubled, and they also made certain other recommendations in his favour, and in accordance with his demands; but they said that the allowance should be made contingent on good behaviour and on the condition that the Mehtar and his son accepted the advice of the British Agent or his deputy on all matters. It was also a condition of the grant that he should consent to the permanent residence of a British officer in his country. Now, if that country was inside the British frontier, there would have been no necessity to apply to the Mehtar for his consent, and no necessity to make any bargain whatever with him. At that moment Chitral was absolutely independent, and we have no right to put a Resident there without the consent of the Mehtar. These terms were agreed upon, and he agreed, of course, to this Resident, and now we come to the conditions under which this Residency was formed. The first important document on this point is dated October 19, 1892, which is a very important Dispatch from the Government of India to the Secretary of State. I am again at a disadvantage in quoting this Dispatch, because it has been very freely "Bowdlerised." There is one omission from it to which I should like to call the attention of the noble Lord the Secretary of State. I do not expect him to answer me now, but it is a question on which he should consult the permanent authorities at the India Office and have some well-understood rule laid down. As the House knows, when the Indian Government considers any question every member of that Government has a right to record his dissent from the Dispatch which is sent to England. That right is given by virtue of an Act of Parliament, and that dissent is bound to be submitted to the Secretary of State. It seems to me that when the Secretary of State lays a Dispatch on the Table of this House to which Dispatch there were dissents, those dissents should accompany the Dispatch, so that the House should be in a position to know whether the Dispatch was or was not unanimous, and what were the reasons which induced certain Members of the Indian Government to dissent from it? (Hear, hear.) My right hon. friend the member for the Forest of Dean attached some importance to the apparent unanimity on the Indian Council on this question, but I am not making a statement which will be disputed—in fact, I shall prove it by subsequent statements in a later Dispatch—when I say that this is not a unanimous Dispatch and that there were very important and very serious dissents from it. The House has got to take Dispatches as they find them. We have lately had occasion——

MR. RADCLIFFE COOKE interrupting, said: I rise to order, Sir. I observe an hon. member below the Gangway reading his correspondence in the House. I desire to ask whether such a proceeding is in order?

MR. SPEAKER: It is against the Rules of the House to open and read private correspondence in the House.

SIR H. FOWLER, continuing, proceeded to read from the Dispatch as follows: "We have lately had occasion to consider further the question of our future policy in Gilghit and the surrounding States and the strength at which it would be necessary to maintain the British Agency in order to carry out that policy effectively. The proposals of Colonel Durand and the Resident in Kashmir on these points have been before us for some months, and we have had the advantage of discussing them with Colonel Durand. The conclusion to which we have come is that it will not be necessary to make any increase in the number of troops in the Gilghit Agency, either British or Kashmir. We have relieved the 200 Goorkhas by 205 Sikhs, and we have sent up a small detachment of sappers, but on the other hand, we have withdrawn the mountain guns sent up last year." I quote that as showing that the Government of India—that was at the time when Lord Lansdowne was Viceroy—were of opinion that the object was to watch any proceedings on the Hindu Kush. The difficulty of supplying the troops at Gilghit was so great that it was necessary to keep the force down to the lowest possible point. The Government of India also proposed an increase of two additional political officers, an addition to the number of military officers, and, no doubt, although it does not appear, I think, in these extracts, one was placed at Chitral. It was their duty, it was stated, to avoid as far as possible entangling themselves in the disputes of the natives. The Secretary of State approved of this proposal; but there is a letter addressed by the Secretary to the Government of India to the Resident at Kashmir which, I think, more fully explains the policy of the Government than that developed in their Dispatch. That Dispatch is as follows:—"I am directed to address you on the subject of our future policy in Gilghit and the surrounding States. You were informed that the Government of India had no intention of pushing the project for the construction of a road through the territory occupied by the Indus Valley tribes. It was also pointed out to you that no action should be taken likely to lead to a collision with the Chilasi tribes, and that their headmen should be treated in a conciliatory manner. It will be your duty to inform the British Agent in Gilghit of the instructions you have thus received, and to impress upon him and the officers of the Agency the necessity of acting strictly in accordance with them. The Government of India have now had under their consideration the strength of the force which should be maintained for the future in the neighbourhood of Gilghit. The force in question is obviously intended for a twofold purpose. It is intended, in the first place, as an obstacle in the way of a Russian advance against Gilghit through the passes of the Hindu Kush; and, in the second, to watch the tribesmen of Hunza and Nagar and the adjoining States. In regard to the second object, it is to be hoped that the effect produced upon the surrounding tribes by the successful operations against Hunza and Nagar will for some time to come render them unlikely to cause trouble. I am to impress upon you strongly that it is the desire of the Government of India that the officers of the Agency should carefully avoid any action which might have the effect of bringing about hostilities. Their efforts should, on the contrary, be directed to endeavouring by means of conciliatory measures, to establish the most amicable relations with the tribes. Apart from the political objections which the Government of India entertain to a policy which might have the effect of involving us in further military operations on this part of the frontier, numerous proofs have lately been afforded of the costliness of maintaining a large force in the neighbourhood of Gilghit. It will, moreover, be obvious to you that, upon general grounds, there are serious objections to keeping considerable portions of the native army in so distant and isolated a position. Under these circumstances, and assuming that the policy which has thus been laid down will be rigorously adhered to, the Government of India see no occasion for adding to the strength of the Gilghit garrison. Considering the great difficulty of transporting supplies across the passes by which Gilghit is divided from Kashmir, there would be obviously great advantages in fixing the strength of the garrison at a number which the country itself would be able to support. That number would, it is understood, not exceed about 1,600 men. Upon this point and upon the distribution of the troops in the neighbourhood of Gilghit and throughout the line of communication no decision will be come to until Colonel Durand's arrival in Simla. The Governor General in Council gathers from your telegram of the 18th inst. that you and Colonel Durand are both of opinion that the garrison of Gilghit itself might be safely reduced to the strength of one regiment and a battery, the remainder of the Imperial Service Troops being stationed along the line between Bunji and Astor. I may observe that the Government of India, while admitting that it will always be necessary to maintain a small body of British troops as an escort to the Resident, are not without hope that it may eventually be found possible to hold Gilghit with a force consisting mainly of local levies raised from amongst the neighbouring tribes, and entirely dependent upon local supplies. In this view it is desirable that the utmost encouragement should be given to the spread of cultivation in the neighbourhood. The Government of India are satisfied that the re-establishment of the Gilghit Agency was undoubtedly necessary, and that the operations against Hunza and Nagar were inevitable. Now that these have been brought to a successful conclusion, it is hoped that it may in the future be found possible to secure the passes and to maintain peace in the Dand States without adding materially to the burdens of the Empire."

That brings us down to the summer of 1892. In August, 1892, the Mehtar died, after a rule of something like 30 years. He was a man of great ability and firmness, and after his death there followed what our officer described as a period of "dynastic murders and civil war." The eldest son was 31 and the second 24. The latter, Nizam ul Mulk, succeeded, and the elder, Afzal ul Mulk, fled to British protection at Gilghit. Nizam murdered all the brothers he could get hold of. The Government of India at once acknowledged the man in possession, and he at once asked for a British officer to be sent to him at Chitral. Immediately before this the uncle of Nizam, brother of the old Mehtar, made a sudden descent in the night, slaughtered Nizam, and took possession of the throne. He ruled about two months. Afzal, then at Gilghit, had no doubt of the support of the British Resident. I am not justified in saying that Afzal was encouraged, but he was permitted to advance into the territory of Chitral, and he became Mehtar. I deeply regret the interference of the British Agent in the internal affairs of Chitral. He had been expressly prohibited from doing so, but the Government of India, after further investigation, came to the conclusion that under the circumstances his action was justifiable, and approved of what he had done. Up to three years ago there was no Resident in Chitral; therefore we are perfectly free from complications in considering this question. We are free from what is called "abandonment"—running away. The Agent appointed was Dr. Robertson, and in a despatch dated April 3, 1893, he said that "the atmosphere was one of conspiracy and intrigue." We never intended that his mission should be more than temporary, and we considered that after he had recognised the new Mehtar it was undesirable that he should remain any longer in Chitral. Dr. Robertson left, but he deemed it desirable to leave Captain Younghusband and Lieutenant Gurdon behind him. In June, 1893, he presented a very interesting Report, which showed what was his opinion then. I thank the Government for giving us that despatch, but we have not Sir George Robertson's Report in 1895. (Hear, hear.) It is much more important to be in possession of his views in 1895 than in 1893, particularly as the Government attached great importance to Dr. Robertson's views in 1893. When he arrived at Chitral, he says:—"Instead of finding ourselves in the position of envoys sent to congratulate and form an alliance with a young prince flushed with recent triumphs over rebellious subjects and powerful outside foes, we found ourselves called upon to firmly establish on his throne, and infuse with hope and verile energy, an unnerved, terror-stricken chief who was conscious that he ruled on the merest sufferance a thoroughly disaffected people, whose abstention from further outbreaks of violence was entirely due to a donbt and fear lest the Government of India might have the will and also the power to avenge any injury to its nominee. That under such peculiar circumstances any permanence can be expected for the work already successfully accomplished would be unreasonable, unless the same plans which have worked so well in the immediate past be steadily persevered with in the immediate future. Military force other than that which the Mehtar himself can organise and direct it would be impolitic to use in Chitral, even if it were possible to employ it at such an enormous distance from its base of reinforcements and supplies in Kashmir or India. The upper classes have to be won over and conciliated by friendly overtures, apparently emanating from men absolutely secure and confident in their strength and position, while at the same time the imagination of the Adamzadas must be acted upon by the spectacle of their ruler being securely protected from all outside enemies and gradually making himself feared and respected by the firmness, combined with justice, of his rule, and by the display of the wealth and resources he possesses as the subsidised ally of his acknowledged suzerain, his Highness the Maharajah of Kashmir. That there are many difficulties in the way of carrying out such a line of policy it would be idle to deny, but there are also two factors, the value of which cannot be over-estimated, as favouring influences in any attempts we may make to mould the Chitralis to our interest, especially if these favouring influences be employed discreetly and with dexterity. They are, first, the absence of any real fanatical feeling in Chitral; and, secondly, the extreme impressionability of the people. The absence of all sentiments of religious intolerance in Chitral amounts to a national peculiarity. The impressionability of Chitralis, again, is something extraordinary. It undoubtedly makes them terribly fickle. But fickleness tells both ways. If you cannot rely upon unswerving supporters in changeable people, you can at least be happy in the thought that they can rarely become inveterate opponents. When great impressionability is combined with extreme cupidity, for which Chitralis are also remarkable, the power of influencing them lies with the man of most tactful speech, especially if he also possesses the longest purse. Polite attentions, complimentary speeches, have a great, if ephemeral, effect on most Chitralis. When accompanied by a small douceur they not unfrequently have the effect of starting the recipient to his feet with his eyes dimmed by grateful tears, his mouth full of fervid protestations of devotion. It is true his gratitude rapidly cools, but it can be excited again as often as is desirable by a re-employment of the means described. It follows, therefore, that a political officer in Chitral has a wonderful power always at hand of influencing for a time all those brought into direct contact with him. All manner of apparently determined enemies of the Mehtar, Adamzadas, Moghli Pirs, Sayads, as well as intriguers of other classes, succumbed at once to the not very subtle influences employed against them, while, as soon as it became generally known that I preferred expressions of loyalty to their Mehtar to hearing speeches of personal devotion to myself, the alteration I desired was made almost invariably." I think the Chitralis have something in common with western races when pleasant speeches are accompanied by long purses. Sir George Robertson wrote that—"An Englishman may now travel anywhere throughout the length and breadth of Chitral without the slightest fear. He would be welcomed everywhere. The mission returned with no escort, unless Mr. Bruce's four Gurkhas may be so denominated. There were no sentries at night, no suspicion of danger at any time. A district in the heart of British India could not appear more peaceful and quiet. Such is the result of merely five months' work in the country." This was written in June, 1893, and it only shows how the greatest men may be deceived. In 18 months all was altered. The Indian Government, however, came to the conclusion that Captain Younghusband should remain for the present, though not at the capital. Colonel Durand proposed to make his quarters 63 miles away. That Dispatch was replied to by Lord Kimberley, and Lord Kimberley's Dispatch again is not given in full; but I am able to supply a very serious omission in it out of the Blue Book itself. Lord Kimberley, after referring to Dr. Robertson's Report and to the Dispatch of the Government of India, says:—"I observe that, in your opinion, the maintenance of an English officer as Political Agent in Chitral renders necessary the retention of strong posts along the line of the Gilghit and Gizr river, and it is partly on this account and partly to paralyse any hostile action of the tribes having relations with the Gilghit Agency that your Excellency's Government desires the permanent addition of a Bengal infantry battalion to the garrison of the Gilghit Agency. But in determining our future policy towards Chitral a wider view must be taken, and the question must be looked at with reference to the general aspect of affairs in that region, which may in a short time be considerably changed." That was what Lord Kimberley wrote. But it would be altogether an unintelligible sentence where he speaks of "the general aspect of affairs" if, in the editing of these dispatches, they had not edited other letters which contained the pith of that portion of Lord Kimberley's dispatches. The Secretary to the Government of India, writing to the Resident in Kashmir, stated what was the general aspect of affairs in that region which Lord Kimberley thought might be changed, and which would seriously affect the whole question. He says:—"When a review of the position on this frontier was placed before the Secretary of State for India nearly a year ago, Lord Kimberley sanctioned the retention of Captain Younghusband in Chitral as a temporary measure only, and pointed to three possible contingencies which would materially affect the general aspect of affairs in that region. Those contingencies were (1) the abandonment by the Amír of all idea of bringing Chitral under his control; (2) the successful conclusion of the negotiations with Russia for the determination of boundaries in the Pamir tract; and (3) the mitigation, through the mediation of our frontier officers, of the irritation and suspicion of the frontier tribes." The Amír, at the close of 1893, bound himself not to interfere with Chitral by the Agreement concluded with Sir Mortimer Durand. In June, 1894, the Government of India appear to have addressed the Resident in Kashmir, pointing out to him that the first of the conditions to which Lord Kimberley had attached importance had been attained by the Durand Agreement; that there were indications that a Pamir settlement might before long be arrived at; and that the attitude of the tribes was fairly satisfactory. "In these circumstances, you were informed that, if no new complications arose, the political officer in Chitral should be withdrawn when the winter was over." At the time of that letter—in June—the Pamir Agreement was still unsigned; there was still suspicion among the tribes; and the Government of India came to the conclusion that—"For another year our position in and towards Chitral must remain upon the present footing. It appears that Colonel Bruce and Captain Younghusband advocate a policy of activity and extension, which is not in accord with the views of the Government of India." This is not from London; this letter is written from Calcutta to the Resident in Kashmir, and expresses the view of the Government of India; and the hon. member for the Forest of Dean will, no doubt, attach much importance to that. The Dispatch continues:—"I am to request that this policy may be impressed on the British Agent, and that he may be clearly informed that it is not intended to maintain permanently a resident officer in Chitral. It will suffice to retain the unquestioned right of sending a political officer into Chitral at all times." That Dispatch was submitted to me—I had then succeeded to office—and I then stated, on August 3rd, 1894:—"The reasons which induced Lord Kimberley to declare that it would be 'premature to decide now on the permanent political and military arrangements for this frontier' are still of weight. It is true that the Amír of Afghanistan no longer advances any claims to exercise control in the affairs of Chitral, but the settlement of the frontier on the south-west and south of Chitral may still lead to troublesome complications. while on the north the question of the line delimitating the Russian boundary in the regions of the Upper Oxus is still unsettled. It was perhaps premature, in these circumstances, to raise the question of withdrawing Captain Younghusband from Chitral, and I fully concur in your decision that the moment for effecting what would certainly be regarded as a final withdrawal is inopportune, and, while adhering to Lord Kimberley's view that the present arrangements can only be regarded as temporary, I am no more prepared than Lord Kimberley was last year to formulate a definite policy (whether of abandoning or continuing those arrangements) within the fixed period such as is indicated." In other words, the view that Lord Kimberley, the Governor of India, and that I myself ventured to take was that, so long as the boundary of the Amír was unfixed and the boundary with Russia unsettled, it was wise and prudent to make no change in the position of the resident officer at Chitral, but that when those questions were settled—and the House knows they have been now settled for a considerable time—he should be withdrawn. I now come to another extraordinary illustration of the editing of these papers. In the Dispatch from the Government of India, to which my Dispatch was a reply, there is not a word about the road to Peshawar. But in my reply this passage is given:—"I approve also of your decided rejection of the proposals for establishing a political officer and an escort in Yasin and for opening up the road between Peshawar and Chitral." The House will see from that, that it had been proposed to the Government of India to make this road, that they declined to make it, and that the late Government concurred with them in their opinion. That brings us down to the end of 1894. In 1895, on January 1, the Nizam-ul-Mulk was murdered by a follower of his brother, Amir-ul-Mulk. I am not going to trouble the House with the history of that occurrence, but my own opinion is that the whole of those transactions formed part of one conspiracy between Umra Khan, Sher Afzal, and Amir-ul-Mulk. Lieutenant Gurdon was in Chitral when the murder took place, with eight or ten Sikhs. Dr. Robertson was at once sent to Chitral to report on the situation, where he arrived on February 1, and then commenced the difficulties of the situation. The Government of India very soon advised us at home of the serious position of affairs, and our Government felt that their first duty was to rescue Dr. Robertson. I did not hesitate myself; on March 8 I received for the first time an official intimation that Robertson was in danger in Chitral, and on the same day I telegraphed:—"I am prepared to approve such action for securing safety of Robertson and party as you may deem necessary." In other words, the Government of India had a free hand in order to rescue Robertson. (Hear, hear.) The House remembers what took place—the prompt action of the Government of India, the magnificent preparations of Sir Robert Low, and the wonderful mobilisation of that force of men in less than three weeks. On March 14 the Government issued a Proclamation to all the people of Swat, the people in Bajaur who did not side with Umra Khan, and all other persons concerned, which, after stating that Umra Khan had invaded the district and had had warning that he was to retire from the district by April 1, and if he did not the Government would send a force into Chitral to the rescue of Robertson, proceeded:—"The sole object of the Government of India is to put an end to the present and prevent any future unlawful aggression on Chitral territory, and as soon as this object has been attained the force will be withdrawn. The Government of India have no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which Umra Khan's misconduct may now force them to pass, or of interfering with the independence of the tribes, and they will scrupulously avoid any acts of hostility towards the tribesmen so long as they on their part refrain from attacking or impeding in any way the march of the troops." Within a fortnight of the receipt of the telegram announcing that Proclamation I telegraphed:—"As soon as present trouble is over, policy with regard to Chitral and neighbourhood will have to be fully and carefully considered in light of recent events. Meantime our hands should be kept perfectly free. I hope, therefore, that you will take care that nothing is said or done to commit Government either way with regard to making new roads or retention of posts now occupied, or occupation of new posts." The House will remember the brilliant advance that was made, the brilliant relief from Gilghit under Colonel Kelly, and the successful termination on about April 18 or 20, when the siege was raised and Robertson relieved. On April 26, I addressed a Dispatch to the Government of India on the whole question of future policy. I said:—"Since that Dispatch was written the protracted discussion as to the limit of Russian influence in the region of the Upper Oxus has been brought to a close, and an agreement has been arrived at by which the southern boundary of Russia's possessions in these regions will be the Panja and the Pamir rivers, and a line drawn eastward from Lake Victoria to the Chinese frontier. The effect of this will be, while bringing her in one direction within a very short distance of the Chitral frontier, to maintain in the other an intervening belt of country between her southern outposts and the eastern end of the Hindu-kush. Moreover, the demarcation of the Afghan boundary under the Durand agreement, in which the Amír undertakes to abstain from interference in Chitral and the transfer to Afghanistan of the whole of the Kafir country up to Chitral, introduces a new element into the problem. The delimitation of these boundaries would, apart from recent events in Chitral, have introduced changes indicating that the time had arrived for some general survey of the existing situation, in order that the policy which had been provisionally adopted might now be settled on some permanent basis; but these events themselves have brought into strong relief the risk involved in maintaining a British officer in Chitral under existing conditions, a risk not unforeseen by your predecessor, but one which, owing to the peculiar combination of a popular claimant to the Chitral throne with the Pathan invaders, has taken a more acute form than was probably present to the minds of the Marquis of Lansdowne and his advisers. On the one hand, it has been made clear that, so long as a British Agent and his escort in Chitral can be supported only from Gilghit, he may for months be cut off from any support at all, and at best can only be supplied from a small and inaccessible frontier station by means of a road 200 miles in length, and of the worst possible description for military purposes: while to maintain a garrison at Gilghit, adequate for such military responsibilities as the existing combination has thrown upon you, would involve an intolerable financial burden, both upon the Kashmir Government and on your own. On the other hand, the shorter and more direct line of communication between Peshawar and Chitral involves the gravest responsibilities, both military and financial. The establishment and maintenance of this line of communication has been recognised as an important element in the policy of your Government in Chitral, but it was at first hoped that, by the influence of Umra Khan, an arrangement might be come to with the Pathan tribes, through whose territory the route runs, for affecting this object. As it became clear that the assistance of Umra Khan was not likely to be obtained, the project was laid by: but it has always been urged by the local authorities as essential to the security of the agency of Chitral. The question whether such a road running 150 miles through the territory of the Pathan tribes, notorious for their fanaticism and hostility to foreigners, can be maintained at all without constant military pressure or even military occupation, is one which is open to discussion; but in any case it is certain that it cannot be maintained without heavy expenditure from year to year, and it is possible that if maintained by arrangement with the tribes it might at the most critical time be closed against us, and the whole work of opening it up by military force would in that case have to be undertaken again from the beginning." I then asked the Government of India for their views, and on May 8, 1895, they sent their views to me. In fact, this is the last Dispatch we had from the Government of India on this question. I need not go through that Dispatch in detail. The Government of India attaches enormous importance to maintaining our position in Chitral, because of the risk of foreign occupation if it were abandoned, and they maintained that it would be unjustifiable to ignore our pledges to preserve the suzerainty of Kashmir. I am not aware that anything has transpired in Chitral to jeopardise the suzerainty of Kashmir. But when the Indian Government came to the means by which their policy is to be carried out, then their Dispatch becomes very misty. They say:—"What must be faced is a consideration of the means whereby we can maintain a sufficient military occupation of the Chitral valley. The length of time occupied and the difficulty incurred in sending troops and supplies by way of Kashmir and Gilghit, and the expense of doing so, are so great that some of us would prefer to abandon all attempt to occupy Chitral rather than try to hold it by so precarious a thread. The alternative is to establish communication from the Peshawar border. The expense of doing so may be prohibitive." They then set out other objections, and say that the course which we recommend may involve the Government in an expense which the finances of India can ill afford, and an increase of responsibilities with the tribes of our north-west frontier, which we would fain avoid. It may be possible to lessen these objections." And they concluded by saying that, at all events, the interests involved were so large that they considered it their plain duty to lay before me the conclusions at which, after full consideration, they had arrived. That is the history down to the date of the last despatch which I received from the Government of India. Before considering the question of future policy, I think there is one point upon which we are all agreed, and that is if a British officer with an escort is to be maintained at Chitral, it will be impossible to secure his safety so long as he relies alone upon Gilghit for his transport and his supplies. Gilghit is itself an outpost cut off for half the year. From there to Chitral is 225 miles, the road being across a pass 12,000ft. high and running through that dangerous defile in which Captain Rose and his party were destroyed. If Chitral is to be held by British troops, it can only be by opening up and maintaining a road from Peshawar, through Dir, to Swat. I say that because it is impossible to separate the policy of retaining Chitral from that of making and maintaining this road. If we are committed to the establishment of a permanent garrison in Chitral, we are committed to the maintaining of this road, and that means the occupation of the whole State of Chitral and the whole of the country lying between the frontier and Chitral. So far as the military aspect of the matter is concerned, the question is simply this: Is the fortification of Chitral a strategic necessity for the adequate defence of the Indian frontier in the event of an attack upon its north-west? The natural fortification of that district is the vast range of the Hindu-kush, which is so picturesquely and forcibly described by the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Curzon). But, Sir, no Government can act upon geographical possibilities or upon an opinion which it has formed upon them. This was a purely military question, and I, as Secretary of State for India, was incapable of deciding such a question. My colleagues were under the same incapacity, and the present Government must be guided also by military consideration and also by military experts. The House is aware that there is a very considerable difference of opinion upon this question. The House is aware, from publication in the *Times* newspaper, that Lord Roberts, an authority for whom I entertain very great respect, entertains one opinion: we know from the despatch of the Government of India that the two eminent soldiers who advise that Government—Sir George White and Sir Henry Brackenbury—also agree in that view, and if I understand the view put forward by them, it is that Chitral is of the greatest strategical importance so far as the heads of the passes of the Hindu-Kush are concerned; that the invasion of India from the north-west could be attempted through those passes, and that Chitral, being a weak Power, would fall under the power of its strongest neighbour. But, Sir, the British Government and the Government of India at home have also military advisers. They have as a military adviser that distinguished Field-Marshal who commanded the Indian army for a considerable number of years, and who served for upwards of 40 years in India, and whom Lord Rosebery described as the highest living Indian military authority—I mean Sir Donald Stewart. As the House knows, there are also Sir Neville Chamberlain, Sir John Adye, Sir Charles Gough, and Lord Chelmsford, all of whom have served in India, and all of whom have served in this district, and these distinguished officers entertain opinions differing from those of Lord Roberts. But the late Goverement went further, and availed themselves of the best further military advice that they could command. The advice thus given is not part of the State papers which have been published, and it would not be right, therefore, to quote that advice or to give names. But this I may say, that, so far as our military policy was settled, it was guided and settled, so far as military considerations were involved, by and upon the advice of the most eminent military authorities of the day. I sum up their opinions, so far as the results which they produced upon my mind and the minds of my colleagues, to this effect, that the gigantic natural geographical defences of the north-west frontier render the advance of an invading army practically impossible, and that, having regard to these and other considerations, our position is at the present moment practically impregnable: that Chitral is not a place of considerable importance as a base for military reserves, and that it is not useful as a base for military operations, defensive or offensive; that to lock up troops in Chitral or in the Chitral Valley would be an act of the gravest blundering, and that the construction of a military route to Chitral would in the event of hostilities, be an advantage to an invading force and a disadvantage to a defending force.

The late Government also came to the conclusion that Gilghit was sufficient, as it always has been sufficient, as a point of observation, and that to leave our main line of defence and to establish outposts and form depots of supplies in distant mountain deserts and among these mountain tribes, would sadly weaken the strength of our frontier. (Cheers). There were other considerations of a detailed and technical character brought before them, which, with other reasons, convinced the late Government, who looked at the question solely from a military point of view, that they would not be justified in adopting the proposals of the Indian Government. But the late Government had also to consider the political, administrative, and financial questions affecting the occupation of Chitral, accompanied by the occupation of a military road. The length of the road proposed to be occupied is 180 miles, or the distance from London to Manchester. The Malakand Pass is over 4,000 feet high, and there is another pass 11,000 feet high. The road, if made, will have to be garrisoned in four places, and there must be cantonments, forts, and bridges made, while tunnels will have to be made for the protection of the road from the snows of winter. In fact, the road would be an isthmus between two large tracts of territory extending on the one side to the Afghan frontier, and on the other to the present frontier of Kashmir. The late Government were were advised by experts that the formation of such a road meant the practical subjection of the tribes, and the annexation of the country between Peshawar and Chitral. Only 36 miles of this road will be in Chitral territory, and the rest will have to be constructed through a country inhabited by hostile tribes, who are distinguished by the fierceness of their fanaticism, their love of independence, and their fear of annexation. We have no more right, legally, in the committing of nations in the district than we should have in Switzerland. Lord Roberts has stated that the whole fighting force of these tribesmen is about 200,000 men. Have Government asked themselves whether it would not be better to have these tribes as independent allies, who would form another line of defence, rather than to have them as revengeful foes? (Cheers). When we have conquered them we shall have created a permanent source of discontent and danger, and they will seriously weaken our power to resist the attack of any hostile force. The practical question, which will sooner or later have to be determined by this House, is, whether we are going to extend the frontier of India by at least 200 or 250 miles on the western side, in order to cover a large tract of country from which we can derive no possible advantage, and from which we can obtain no possible revenue, and in which we may be constantly embroiled with independent tribesmen, patriotically defending their native soil? (Cheers.) Sir J. Lyall, the late Governor of the Punjab, who knows something about the country in question, said that he was assured that the initial cost of making such a road, and guarding it during construction, would be no less than half-a-million sterling, and that it would take three years to construct. Sir J. Lyall further stated that the tribes would certainly not assent to the making of such a road, and that, therefore, unless there was a military occupation of a line 180 miles long, it would be impossible to construct the road. According to the present computation, 5,000 or even 10,000 men would have to be interned in almost inaccessible districts, to whom supplies must be carried by pack animals, under enormous difficulties and at great cost. I am aware that the Government of India have said that they are not going to increase the Indian Army, but in that case the present Indian Army must be too large. (Hear, hear.) I do not believe that that Army is too large, and, therefore, I hold that to lock up any part of it in a place from which it cannot be withdrawn if troubles arise would be most unwise. (Hear, hear.) There then remains what I may call the moral question to be determined. The Government of India, by their proclamation, declared that they had no intention of permanently occupying any territory through which our troops might pass. When that proclamation was issued, there were two witnesses that I may quote as to the impression that it conveyed. In the first place, the *Times* correspondent said that it was manifest that the Indian Government did not intend to annex any territories through which our troops might march But the more important testimony with reference to the meaning of that declaration of the Indian Government was given by the present Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who wrote as follows with regard to it:—"I see that the Indian Government say that as soon as they have attained their object in Chitral the British force will be withdrawn, and that there is no intention of occupying the intervening territory. Of course that may be technically true—no one wants to add to our responsibilities, which are already sufficiently heavy; but if this proclamation means, as it may undoubtedly be interpreted to mean, that, having opened up the essential and inevitable route to Chitral we are going to allow it again to be closed, it will be difficult to find words to describe the melancholy fatuity of such a course. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Curzon said the sentence in his letter in the *Times* was based on an imperfect telegraphic summary of the Viceroy's Proclamation in that paper. He presumed that was correct, but when they read the proclamation itself they found it contained a distinct limitation, in the first sentence of the proclamation, to the people of Swat and Bajaur. (Ministerial cheers.)

Sir H. Fowler: It is confined to Swat and Bajaur and to any other persons concerned. (Opposition cheers). I am talking about the people of Swat and Bajaur, of their thousands and tens of thousands of tribes. But that is a new interpretation of what is technically true. What did the Government of India mean by it? Let me turn to their Dispatch of April 26th, page 39:—"At the same time a proclamation was issued to the people of Swat and others beyond the Peshawar frontier announcing the intention and object of the Government, assuring them that we did not intend to permanently occupy any territority through which the force might pass, or interfere with the independence of the tribes, and promising friendly treatment to all who did not oppose the march of the troops." That was how the Government of India interpreted their own Proclamation. In the interpretation of human affairs you not only deal with men's words but actions. How did they interpret these actions? "Major Deane at once commenced negotiations with the Swatis and other tribes concerned, and explained the situation to them. The assistant British Agent at Gilghit, having reported that all the men of Tangir and Darel had been recalled to their homes, which possibly indicated some excitement there, he was authorised to explain to the people the purport of the Proclamation issued to the Swatis and the Bajauris." What did the tribes understand us to mean; what did everybody understand us to mean? You may go through 70 or 80 miles. You are bound by your Proclamation that far, but not in other districts, because they are not included in "all other persons concerned." Practically, the Government of India prevented opposition on the faith of this, and the noble Lord, in his own Despatch of the 16th of last month, recapitulating the whole case, says:—"It is probable that this Proclamation was not without effect, at all events on the tribes in immediate contact with us." The native tribes did not combine against us. What was our danger? It was a holy war of religious fanaticism aroused, and the whole case proves there was no combination against us among the tribes, because they believed in British honour—(cheers)—and that the British Government would fulfil that to which they were pledged. You talk to the Indian Government of "prestige!" That word has been used frequently with reference to the advance on the north-western frontier. It was a word with which we were familiar in the great debate on the evacuation of Kandahar in this House 14 or 15 years ago. We we told our prestige required that we should not abandon the position we had acquired by splendid daring and splendid endurance, and that we could not afford to break our plighted faith. Loss of prestige! Do you think these tribes do not understand and do not appreciate the brilliancy of the attack and the defence? But they will understand if you recede from your word, when, having conquered their country, you were allowed to pass over these terrific passes unopposed on the faith of the Proclamation. Since you have conquered that country, the prestige and honour of the British name will be still greater if you have the courage to keep your word. (Cheers).

Lord George Hamilton: Do I understand the right hon. gentleman to say that Lord Elgin cannot be trusted to keep his word? (Cheers).

Sir H. Fowler: The noble lord will be quite at liberty to reply when I have finished. I have said nothing about Lord Elgin. But I say that if the British or Indian Government annex any portion of the territory through which they passed last March, April, or May, that Government, whether Indian or British, will have broken its faith with the tribes to whom

"INDIA."

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

Subscriptions to INDIA for 1896 should be paid at once either direct to the London Office as below, or to the Secretary of the Congress Circle in which the Subscriber resides. The names of the various Secretaries are to be found on the third page of the cover of INDIA, and these gentlemen will, on application, be glad to give any information respecting the journal.

W. DOUGLAS HALL,
Manager of INDIA,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, London, S.W.

's the end of his Dispatch the
He says: "It was apparent
t your Government was not
ask of opening up this road
the military coercion of the
heir independence, be one of
h embarrassing complications
liency; but in your opinion
ncial and political aspects,
ght be assumed by the tribes,
le relations could be secured
become responsible for the
not be prohibitive" The
on "that peaceful arrange-
' The information now con-
. It removes, if your officers
tions, the doubt which was
ng up the road by peaceful
an intolerable burden of ex-
lian revenues." I am bound
consistent in his telegrams
e gave a strict caution as to
lamation. The noble Lord
s: If the cost is not pro-
eful arrangement with the
a permanent force on the
Proclamation are rigidly ad-
anction the proposal of the
until these "ifs" are solved
nd I go further and say we
answer to that dispatch,
he house what the occupa-
the tribes is, whether they
and whether the arrange-
Proclamation, no intelligible
en by the Government. A
year will not affect their
tude we can afford to wait.
ce a judgment; I think it
as been my duty to explain
ate Government thought it
views of those best quali-
een the main object of my
t the policy I have en-
icy. One of the greatest
—Lord Lawrence—in the
closed his administration,
guide the action of the
the north-west frontier of
graphs of that dispatch:—
se to decrease any of the
on Russia if that Power
a, as we should certainly
tier and met her half-way
the midst of a hostile or
no limits to the expendi-
re, and we protest against
dditional taxation on the
as it is, to bear such pres-
th understand and appre-
which we have at heart, in
ia, may be attained by an
on our frontier, and by
all our resources for the
ends over which we can
control. Should a foreign
y think of invading India
bable, of stirring up the
within it, our true policy,
e conceive, be found to lie
lements at either Kabul,
in full reliance on a com-
ed army stationed within
order; in the contentment,
es; in the sense of security
ch our whole policy is
e principal chiefs and the
ction of material works

point, for keeping control over the external affairs of Chitral does not imply annexation or possession of the State. We have absolute control over the external affairs of Afghanistan

within British India, which the comfort of the people while they add to our political and military strength; in husbanding our finances and consolidating and multiplying

The late Government also came t
was sufficient, as it always has
observation, and that to leave ou
establish outposts and form depo
tain deserts and among these :
weaken the strength of our fr
other considerations of a det
brought before them, which, wi
late Government, who looked
military point of view, that t
adopting the proposals of the
late Government had also to co
tive, and financial questions
Chitral, accompanied by the
The length of the road propose
the distance from London to
Pass is over 4,000 feet high, and
high. The road, if made, will
places, and there must be c
made, while tunnels will have
the road from the snows of wi
an isthmus between two large
the one side to the Afghan fr
present frontier of Kashmir.
were advised by experts that
meant the practical subjection
tion of the country between
miles of this road will be in C
have to be constructed throug
tribes, who are distinguis
fanaticism, their love of inde
ation. We have no more ri
nations in the district than
Lord Roberts has stated that
tribesmen is about 200,000
themselves whether it would
as independent allies, who w
rather than to have then
When we have conquered th
manent source of discontent
weaken our power to resist
The practical question, whi
determined by this House, i
the frontier of India by at l
side, in order to cover a lar
can derive no possible
can obtain no possible
be constantly embroiled
patriotically defending the
Lyall, the late Governor of
about the country in quest
the initial cost of making s
construction, would be no l
that it would take three
further stated that the trib
making of such a road, an
military occupation of a li
possible to construct the r
putation, 5,000 or even 10
in almost inaccessible dist
ried by pack animals, und
cost. I am aware that t
that they are not going t
that case the present Indi
hear.) I do not believe
therefore, I hold that to l
which it cannot be withdra
unwise. (Hear, hear.)
call the moral question to be
India, by their proclamation.
tion of permanently occupying
our troops might pass. When
there were two witnesses that I m
that it conveyed. In the first pl
said that it was manifest that the
intend to annex any territories throu
march But the more important testimony with reference
the meaning of that declaration of the Indian Government was
given by the present Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who
wrote as follows with regard to it :—" I see that the Indian
Government say that as soon as they have attained their object

Elgin. But I say that
annex any portion of the territory through which they passed
last March, April, or May, that Government, whether Indian
or British, will have broken its faith with the tribes to whom

the Proclamation was issued. My right hon. friend the member for the Forest of Dean says his conscience was satisfied when he knew that the Indian Government unanimously recommended this policy of annexation. I am old enough a member of the House to remember the speech the right hon. baronet made on the evacuation of Kandahar, and the Indian Government unanimously objected. (Sir Charles Dilke: "No, no!") I beg my right hon friend's pardon, but I say they did. (Laughter).

Sir C. DILKE: No, no. It was four to three. I will read the names presently. ("Hear, hear!")

Sir H. FOWLER: The majority of the Indian Government.

Sir C. DILKE: You said unanimously.

Sir H. FOWLER: I say that the majority of the Indian Government of 1879-80 were unanimous against the evacuation of Kandahar. The right hon. baronet spoke in this House in favour of the evacuation of Kandahar, and the Duke of Devonshire (then the Marquis of Hartington) dealt, name by name, with the members of the Indian Government, and denounced the proposition then attempted to be laid down by the Tory Party that we were bound by the action of the Indian Government.

Sir C. DILKE: Sir Donald Stewart and the present Lord Cromer.

Sir H. FOWLER: That can be settled hereafter. At all events, the right hon. baronet did not feel bound in 1881 by the opinion of the Indian Government with reference to the evacuation of Kandahar. But, as he is so keen about the Indian Government, why does he not ask the opinion of the great Indian officials and the Governor of the Punjab, who is no mean authority on the question? We know what the opinion of Sir James Lyall and the preceding Governor of the Punjab was. What is the opinion of the present Governor of the Punjab —a man who, perhaps, is the greatest living authority in that district, who knows the country and is responsible for the peace of the frontier? What has been the advice of Sir Dennis Fitzpatrick on the evacuation of Kandahar? I am sorry to weary the House—(Cries of "No.")—with this long defence of the policy of the late Government, but I have said enough, and I will not repeat myself. Under all these circumstances the late Government came to the conclusion that we could not accept the proposition of the Indian Government; and beyond that we had received no reply to our despatch when we went out of office. We came to the conclusion that we could not, on military, political, administrative, or financial grounds, and above all, in the teeth of our own proclamation, advise the taking of any step which would mean the annexation of the Chitral valley. What has been the policy of our successors? The noble Lord immediately on accepting office very properly stated that the present Government would reconsider the question, and on August 1 he asked whether there was no further information as to the possibility of arranging with the tribes for the road between Peshawar and Chitral and the strength of the garrison there. The only information the noble Lord has received is contained in a telegram dated August 4, which says:—"The Commander-in-Chief has been consulted on points in your telegram. First, we have avoided open negotiations with the tribes. The reports received from Low and Deane warrant the confident expectation that a peaceful arrangement for the road can be made." (Cheers.) I am quite willing to wait and see what the peaceful arrangements were, and our judgment should be reserved until we know whether these arrangements have been successful. But they have not been successful to the present time. I have worked out what the force would be, and I make out that there would be about 5,145 soldiers. Taking the present strength of the regiment (and from that the pioneer regiment at Gilghit, which is to be withdrawn, would have to be deducted), the number of soldiers would be between 4,000 and 5,000. The Secretary of State, having received this information, wrote an able dispatch, dated August 16, and in that he reviews the whole situation from the commencement. In reference to the question of cost, he says: "Time evidently was necessary for the investigation and decision of the question of cost." He calls attention to the views expressed by Lord Kimberley and myself as to keeping control over the external affairs of Chitral. Lord Kimberley has been somewhat misunderstood on that point, for keeping control over the external affairs of Chitral does not imply annexation or possession of the State. We have absolute control over the external affairs of Afghanistan at this moment. Then towards the end of his Dispatch the noble Lord sums up the position. He says: "It was apparent from your letter of May 8th, that your Government was not without apprehension that the task of opening up this road might, if it were to necessitate the military coercion of the tribes and the interference with their independence, be one of such great cost and involving such embarrassing complications as to render it of doubtful expediency; but in your opinion this question, both in its financial and political aspects, depended on the attitude which might be assumed by the tribes, and you indicated that, if amicable relations could be secured and they could be persuaded to become responsible for the safety of the road, the cost need not be prohibitive" The noble Lord quotes their allegation "that peaceful arrangements can be made," and adds: "The information now conveyed materially alters the position. It removes, if your officers have rightly estimated the conditions, the doubt which was felt as to the possibility of opening up the road by peaceful means and maintaining it without an intolerable burden of expenditure being imposed on the Indian revenues." I am bound to say the noble Lord is perfectly consistent in his telegrams and his dispatch. He says that he gave a strict caution as to keeping the conditions of the Proclamation. The noble Lord analyses his four "ifs." He says: If the cost is not prohibitive, if you can effect a peaceful arrangement with the tribes, if it is necessary to maintain a permanent force on the Malakand, and if the terms of the Proclamation are rigidly adhered to, then the noble Lord will sanction the proposal of the Government of India. I submit that until these "ifs" are solved he cannot tell what is to be done, and I go further and say we cannot press him. He has had no answer to that dispatch, and until he is in a position to tell the house what the occupation will cost, what the attitude of the tribes is, whether they will recognise a new arrangement, and whether the arrangement will be in harmony with the Proclamation, no intelligible decision as to their policy can be taken by the Government. A few months at this season of the year will not affect their policy. In a question of this magnitude we can afford to wait. I do not ask the House to pronounce a judgment: I think it would be premature to do so. It has been my duty to explain and defend the policy which the late Government thought it wise to adopt after ascertaining the views of those best qualified to advise them, and that has been the main object of my speech. In conclusion, I say that the policy I have endeavoured to defend is no new policy. One of the greatest Viceroys who ever ruled over India—Lord Lawrence—in the memorable dispatch with which he closed his administration, laid down the lines which should guide the action of the Government of India with respect to the north-west frontier of India. I will quote the last three paragraphs of that dispatch:—"We think it impolitic and unwise to decrease any of the difficulties which would be entailed on Russia if that Power seriously thought of invading India, as we should certainly decrease them if we left our own frontier and met her half-way in a difficult country, and possibly in the midst of a hostile or exasperated population. We foresee no limits to the expenditure which such a move might require, and we protest against the necessity of having to impose additional taxation on the people of India, who are unwilling, as it is, to bear such pressure for measures which they can both understand and appreciate, and we think that the objects which we have at heart, in common with all interested in India, may be attained by an attitude of readiness and firmness on our frontier, and by giving all our care and expending all our resources for the attainment of practical and sound ends over which we can exercise an effective and immediate control. Should a foreign Power, such as Russia, ever seriously think of invading India from without, or, what is more probable, of stirring up the elements of disaffection or anarchy within it, our true policy, our strongest security would then, we conceive, be found to lie in previous abstinence from entanglements at either Kabul, Kandahar, or any similar outpost; in full reliance on a compact, highly equipped and disciplined army stationed within our own territories, or on our own border; in the contentment, if not in the attachment, of the masses; in the sense of security of title and possession, with which our whole policy is gradually imbuing the minds of the principal chiefs and the native aristocracy; in the construction of material works within British India, which enhance the comfort of the people while they add to our political and military strength; in husbanding our finances and consolidating and multiplying our resources; in quiet preparation for all contingencies, which no Indian statesmen should disregard; and in a trust in the rectitude and honesty of our intentions, coupled with the avoidance of all sources of complaint which either invite foreign aggression, or stir up restless spirits to domestic revolt." The history of the last twenty years has afforded many startling illustrations of the wisdom of that policy and, I may add, of the folly of departing from it. That policy has been stamped with the approval of a large majority of the great soldiers and great civilians who have rendered our Eastern Empire a priceless boon to the people of India, and the noblest dependency of the British Crown. It is on behalf of that policy I venture, at this almost the last hour of the Session, and in this exhausted House, to enter my humble protest against embarking on an enterprise which may be, and which in this case I conscientiously believe to be, a constant menance and danger to the security and prosperity of India. (Cheers.)

MR. MACLEAN'S AMENDMENT.

THE BURDENS OF INDIAN TAXPAYERS.

THE COST OF ANNEXATION AND OCCUPATION.

Mr. J. M. **Maclean** said, he rose to move the Resolution which stood on the paper in his name:—"That this House views with apprehension the continual increase in the burdens of Indian taxpayers, caused by the annexation or military occupation of large areas of unproductive territory on the land frontier of British India." Instead of concluding with a motion, the right hon. gentleman (Sir H. Fowler) seemed to acquiesce in the present policy of Her Majesty's Government, and throughout he appeared to be really conscious of the fatal weakness of his own case. Obliged by the financial necessities of India to impose obnoxious duties, he flung the money away in the invasion of Chitral, and he was the first to invade the territory of the tribes. Surely nothing could be more immoral than his conduct in sanctioning invasion and then trying to wash his hands of responsibility in the face of the general election. He said the right hon. gentleman, with unusual boldness, had come forward to defend his own policy, and he ought to have concluded with a motion, but instead of doing so, he seemed to acquiesce in the policy of the present Government, and by his action he seemed to show that he was really conscious of the weakness of his own case. They admired the right hon. gentleman as a high-minded statesman, but his career at the India Office was peculiarly unfortunate. The right hon. gentleman was obliged by the financial necessities of India to impose obnoxious duties, and the money so raised he flung away on the invasion of Chitral. The right hon. gentleman was very indignant at the idea that the present Government should invade the territory of the Swati, and said we had no right to be there; but it was he who first invaded that territory; it was with his sanction that enormous forces advanced to invade it. The right hon. gentleman had said a good deal about the opinion of Sir Donald Stewart and others; but did Sir Donald Stewart give his sanction to the invasion, to the opening up by violent means of the road from Peshawar to Chitral? The right hon. gentleman did all the mischief, and now he said it was immoral to invade the territory of the tribes. All along he had told them the policy of the Government of India was to throw this road open. When he made no objection to the crossing of the frontier by an army much larger than that with which Lord Roberts marched from Kabul to Kandahar, he must have been aware that the passage of the army would excite the hostility of the people of the country. While he only made some slight inquiry as to the object of concentrating this large force, he must have known of the vehement criticism to which the action of the Government of India was exposed in India itself. Many persons habitually favourable to the action of the Government of India took strong objection to the mobilisation of this vast force for the relief of the beleagued Governor of Chitral. When the Government of India persevered the right hon. gentleman said, "Go on," and took on himself the responsibility of the invasion of the country and of slaughtering hundreds of patriots in the Malakand Pass. Surely nothing could be more immoral than the conduct of the right hon. gentleman, after he had been a party to all this, in view of the General Election, to try to wash his hands of the responsibility he had incurred and to throw upon the new Government the duty of settling this difficult question. In a telegram of March 18th the Viceroy said: "We are agreed that the military occupation of Chitral, supported by a road to the Peshawar border, is a matter of the first importance." The right hon. gentleman made a temporising reply to that, and then came the further urgent message from the Viceroy of the 25th of April: "Narrative of events indicates withdrawal under present circumstances impossible, and would leave country to complete anarchy, and would render a settlement more difficult. In our opinion, we must also keep open the road from Peshawar for some time, probably three or four months at least, whatever the ultimate decision may be." The right hon. gentleman replied to that: "Pending the final decision of Her Majesty's Government I do not object to the temporary arrangements which you consider necessary." By that telegram the right hon. gentleman did everything he was bound to do at that time. There was no necessity for the great hurry he showed afterwards to come to a definite decision about what should be done at Chitral. The temporary arrangements which the Viceroy said were necessary would have lasted for some months. The Viceroy had said that he had created a state of anarchy in the country, and it was therefore impossible to evacuate it at that time. Within a few weeks the Government was tottering to its fall, and the right hon. gentleman evidently dreaded going to the country without trying to wash his hands of the blood-guiltiness falling upon those who were responsible for the invasion of Chitral. He (Mr. Maclean) acquiesced in the decision of the Government to retain Chitral, because he thought they were bound to accept the statement of the Government of India that it would be impossible to evacuate the country, and he accepted the decision with the more pleasure, because the noble lord in his dispatch pressed for estimates of the exact cost. He had properly guarded himself from taking any hasty action whatever in regard to the opening or permanent occupation of this road by British troops; and he hoped that the noble lord would get trustworthy estimates from the Government of India. A Government which at the end of March could calmly put down £150,000 as the probable cost of the Chitral expedition could not be trusted to give satisfactory estimates unless closely pressed. He also hoped that this was the last of the annexations on the British frontier which would be sanctioned by this or any other Government. The Royal Engineers in India were a most indefatigable body of men, and directly they had obtained possession of and fortified one pass, they found another by which a few stray Cossacks might find their way to British India. Some of them would never be satisfied until Her Majesty's Government had hermetically sealed every mule-track across the immense region of mountain ranges extending from Quetta to the Pamirs. (Laughter.) Then the adventurous traveller came upon the scene, like his right hon. friend the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who unfortunately was prevented from making any more voyages at present. (Laughter.) These travellers seemed to think that wherever they had once set foot the British flag ought to wave for ever afterwards. (Laughter.) Unless strong pressure were put on the Government of India there would be someone proposing to occupy the territory along the other side of the river, and the road leading from the Hindu-Kush to Jellalabad, and the hospitable columns of the *Times* would be full of eloquent declamation about the noble mission of Great Britain in bringing every barbarian nation under its rule. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) It might be a noble mission, but it could not be called a self-sacrificing one, when it was done at the expense of the Indian taxpayer. If this country desired more responsibility in these directions, let her take it at her own risk and cost. Her conduct was of a piece with that of the Government in connexion with the Shahzada, who received a generous invitation to become the guest of the British nation at the expense of the mild Hindu. (Laughter.) If any one looked at the map of India now, and compared it with what it was 20 years ago, beyond the Indus on one side and the Ganges on the other, he would find that an immense empire had been added to our dominions. Beyond these rivers we had almost as much territory as between them; and nearly all of it had been acquired within the last twenty years. It stretched over a frontier several thousand miles in extent; if Afghanistan, which had been brought within our sphere of influence, were included, the responsibility on the shoulders of the Indian taxpayer would appear appalling. For it was India who paid the whole cost of all these expeditions; and the worst of these annexations was that they had been wholly unproductive. Even the kingdom of Burma, which was flourishing when we took it over, costs India a million a year—not a very creditable thing to the present generation of Indian officials. Most of the other annexations not only paid nothing at all, but were very largely subsidised by the Indian Government. India now subsidised all Central Asia from the Indus to the Oxus. The Government either enlisted men of these border tribes in our army and continually increased their pay, or else paid them blackmail to keep the peace. (Hear, hear.) The Government of India was becoming more and more dependent on these border tribes for the security of the Empire, although many of them could not be trusted in an emergency. All the taxes were paid by the industrious traders and merchants of the plains; and nearly the whole of the revenue was spent away from them. Of the fifty millions of revenue, fully one-half went to England, and a very large proportion of the remainder was spent upon troops and expeditions on the frontier, so that the money did not go back to the people who paid the taxes at all. (Hear, hear.) This showed the fallacy of such calculations as were given in the explanatory statement issued this year by the late Secretary of State for India. The right hon. gentleman there spoke of the small burden of taxation in India. It might appear small, but there was this difference between the taxation in England and that in India: the former was all spent within the limits of the country to stimulate trade and industry; but as regards India, it was almost to the extent of three-fourths of the whole spent out of the country in which it was raised. This was because, in England, the Treasury was supreme over all departments, while in India the Treasury was practically helpless. The Government of India was really a military despotism, and the Treasury had only one member on the Council. All the other members might be trusted to act together on questions of Imperial policy. There was no representative of the trade and industry, the culture and intelligence of the country; the members lived for the greater part of the year away in the hills at Simla, and were utterly out of touch with public opinion. They were like the Olympian deities, of whom Tennyson wrote:—

> "There they live and lie reclined,
> On the hills like gods together, careless of mankind."

The possession of India had been of inestimable advantage to us; but how long should we retain India if we did not maintain sound finance there, and see that the people were lightly taxed? The right honourable gentleman the late secretary of State for India several times in his speech made allusion to the agreement made with Russia for the delimitation of territory in the Pamirs. That was signed in March last; it had certainly been concluded before operations in Chitral were sanctioned by the right hon. gentleman, and that alone should have restrained him from taking the action which he had taken. That agreement with Russia altered the whole political situation in India. This policy of occupying the mountain passes was a Chinese-wall policy; it was not the policy meant by Lord Beaconsfield when he sanctioned the "scientific frontier." Then the intention was to push forward to Kandahar, which would have been on the flank of anyone advancing on the principal road to India. But now the policy was not one of pushing forward at all. We were going to lie in wait behind these passes, until the Russians advanced to our frontier. Every military man of repute knew that if ever a Russian invasion of India were to be attempted—and he thought such an event very improbable now—our troops would be obliged to advance to Kandahar or Kabul to meet them; and if we were defeated there, what would be the use of our fortified passes? The enemy would then pour like a torrent into the plains of India, and we should be driven to make a last stand behind the Indies for our Empire in the East. That was a sufficient condemnation of the policy which was now being pursued. But our apprehension in regard to the policy of Russia was removed now that we were going to have the whole frontier fixed from Herat up to the crest of the Pamirs. That would be a blessing to everyone in Central Asia. All the disputes in the past had been occasioned by the acts of frontier officers naturally desirous of distinguishing themselves, who had gone into territories that had not been marked out as belonging to any Power, and so had brought about conflicts which were very much to be regretted. It was to be hoped that that would never again happen after the new arrangement with Russia in regard to the frontier. Our real defence in future would be that, when once the line was fixed, Russia would know that to cross it meant war. Lord Roberts made one sensible remark in a letter to the *Times*. He said that Russia had made no attempt to violate the frontier since it was fixed from near Herat to the Oxus, because she knew that if she did so it would mean war with England, and this would be true as regards the whole line of frontier, now that it was completed to the Pamirs. Lord Beaconsfield in the same spirit, speaking of the evacuation of Kandahar, ridiculed the idea entertained by some fussy people that the possession of one place or another was essential to the security of our Indian Dominion. He said: "The key of India is not Herat or Kandahar. The key of India is London. The majesty and sovereignty, the public spirit, and vigour of our Parliament; the ingenuity and determination of our people—these are the keys of India." He thought that was a profoundly true sentiment. He considered that we might at least lay aside our misgivings as to a Russian invasion of India. He believed Russia would respect our boundaries, and he hoped that, instead of continuing barren conflicts with her, we should enter into an understanding with her for the good of the whole population of Central Asia. Look at what was within our reach if we were to come to a good understanding with Russia. Why should Afghanistan be kept isolated from the commercial world? We had filled the purse, we had pampered the pride of the Amír by the extravagant honours we had paid to his son; we had guaranteed his dominion, and we had got nothing from him in return. Why should not the Amír open his country to trade and commerce? Why should we not join hands with Russia, and bring Afghanistan into the commercial world? It would be an immense boon to India, a great advantage to England, and a benefit to the whole world, to connect the Russian and Indian Railway systems by the construction of a few hundred miles through Afghanistan, and so to complete an overland line to India and introduce railways into the vast regions of Central Asia, which in almost recent times contained populous flourishing empires where stagnation now existed. The record of the past 30 years had been the opening up of Africa. He hoped the next 30 years would see the renaissance of Asia, and would see those vast regions recalled to civilisation. What he asked was, that in order that England might fill an important part in the future of Asia, she should do the work that now lay at her hand. He begged to move his motion.

Mr. M. M. **Bhownaggree**, in a maiden speech, seconded the motion. He said he did so unhesitatingly, because the burden on the Indian taxpayer had grown in recent years to an enormous extent. But he should disclaim any connection between the motion and recent events in Chitral. The word "annexation" had been used in connection with Chitral in the course of the debate; and it was well to point out that it was not very applicable. It was only recently that Sir George Robertson put upon the throne of Chitral its own proper Mehtar, which showed that Chitral was not completely annexed, in the same sense as Burma was annexed. But, at the same time, it could not be denied that recent events in Chitral, the glorious achievements of our army, British and Indian, and the prudent resolution of the Government to retain its hold on Chitral, were capable of being read by ambitious military officers in a somewhat different light from that in which they were regarded on the floor of the House of Commons. Many of the difficulties of the Government of India could be traced to this cause. Ambitious officers had before now embroiled themselves in matters which had made it impossible for the Government to escape being brought into conflict with tribes on the frontier. In order, therefore, that the resolution of the Government to retain Chitral, and the approval of the feats of our army in that region, might not mislead such officers and induce them to follow the same course in future, and also for the reason that there might not be aroused in India an apprehension that the policy of the present Government was annexation, and that they were determined to advance the frontier of India to the furthest limits, and thereby make the burden of the taxpayer so intolerable that India would be plunged into bankruptcy, he begged to second the motion.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON'S REPLY.

Lord **George Hamilton**: The motion which my hon. friends have proposed and seconded is so intimately connected with questions relating to Chitral, that upon it I am able to reply to the speech which the right hon. gentleman has just made. We all welcome back to the House the hon. Member for Cardiff. He always speaks with authority on Indian questions, and, although I cannot agree with all he has said, everything he says is worth listening to. (Hear, hear.) I congratulate my hon. friend the Member for North-East Bethnal Green upon the speech he has just made. He has behind him a record of long and useful public service, and I feel confident both sides of the House will always listen with attention when he speaks on any question connected with our Indian Empire. I now turn to the speech of my predecessor in office. He spoke with great vigour and at very great length. For an hour he made an elaborate historical analysis of the reasons which led us to Chitral. He then proceeded for another hour to attack in the most violent terms, from financial, military, moral, and political points of view, the decision at which we have recently arrived; and, having occupied so much of the time of the House in this denunciation, he concluded by observing that the House was not in possession of sufficient information to enable it to form a judgment. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) I listened with great regret to the right hon. gentleman's speech. These frontier questions are very difficult, whether you go back or go forward. The right hon. gentleman quoted many authorities, but the one authority he did not quote was the Indian Government. (Cheers.) Not once, from beginning to end of his speech, did he allude to the Indian Government, except for the purpose of denouncing it. Our machinery for governing India is of a very complicated and delicate character; and the Secretary of State incurs a grave responsibility if he imposes a policy on the Indian Government contrary to their wishes, and insists upon their trying to carry that policy out through an instrumentality which they consider obsolete and ineffective. It appears that anybody in the street who gave the right hon. gentleman any information of the most extravagant kind whether it was political, financial, or moral, was at once accepted by him as an authority, and the statements made to him were publicly paraded in the House of Commons as reasons why we should refuse the proposal of the Indian Government. "But if," said the right hon. gentleman, "I am wrong, I shall be very glad." Now there is risk, and there always will be risk, attending our Empire in India, and we must face that risk. (Hear, hear.) What we have to consider is whether the decision at which we arrived is a right one. I accept the right hon. gentleman's account of the position which Chitral occupies in connection with the north-west frontier of India and Kashmir; but there is just one point I should like to bring home to the House of Commons. Chitral is at the extreme end of the territory over which Kashmir claims suzerainty, and up to the present moment access to that State has been over some of the most difficult mountain passes in the world. But the difficulty of communication is not all; there is a great length of communication. If anybody will look at the map, he will find that one has to traverse almost a complete circle when going from British India before he arrives at Chitral, and the distance which has to be covered is something like 600 miles, whereas the route from Peshawar is only 180 miles. The important question at present is whether a new road shall be made direct from Peshawar. In dealing with frontier questions it is impossible to lay down one general principle which, under all conditions, must govern our conduct. The right hon. gentleman quoted the opinion of Lord Lawrence. I speak with the utmost respect of that great man. When these frontier questions began to be discussed, in Lord Northbrook's Viceroyalty, I was Under-Secretary for India, and I well remember there were then two schools contending against each other—one led by Sir Bartle Frere, Commissioner of Sind, and the other by Lord Lawrence. Their views were diametrically opposed. Sir Bartle Frere believed that a forward movement was the right movement; he advised advance, and every single advance made from Sind has been attended with good results. Lord Lawrence, as Commissioner of the Punjab, had to deal with a different and more difficult country, and said, "Stay where you are." He was right as regards his own frontier. But every case of this kind which comes up for decision we must look at on its merits. The great mass of the more modern school, with regard to frontier questions, are upon this side of the House, and those of the old-fashioned view sit opposite. We know that at the India Office and amongst retired officers the old-fashioned view prevails; but in India, and it is there where most responsibility rests, opinion is almost invariably opposed to it. The complaint I make against Her Majesty's late advisers is that from the first they made up their minds to get out of Chitral. They forced the Indian Government to send them their policy before they had sufficient information to support it, and they then pounced upon their lack of information to upset the policy associated with it. The right hon. gentleman complains very much of the editing of this Blue-book, and seems to think I have struck out of it papers or minutes which ought to have been given. He must recollect that this correspondence all comes from the Secret Department of the India Office. I have not had one single extract or line of the despatches struck out except in the public interest. These are most confidential documents, and it is impossible to publish them in their entirety. But in every single case where there has been any excision of any kind the fact is noted. The right hon. gentleman thinks I should produce some minutes of Sir Donald Stewart. Sir Donald Stewart is the ex-Commander-in-Chief, and if I were to publish his minutes I must publish the minutes of the present Commander-in-Chief and Sir Henry Brackenbury. The result would be we should publish to the whole world an elaborate analysis of the strong and weak parts of our military system. If the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman were acted upon, we might just as well at once dissolve the Secret Committee of the India Office. Let us see what happened. The right hon. gentleman spent a great deal of time in trying to show that the assent which he and his predecessor, Lord Kimberley, gave to the policy of the Indian Government in Chitral was of a tentative nature. [Sir H. Fowler: Temporary.] Well, temporary. As stated in a despatch of his, there were three objects in view. The first was to control the external affairs of Chitral in a direction friendly to our interests; the second was to secure an effective guardianship over its northern passes; the third was to keep watch over what goes on beyond those passes. These were the objects of the policy of successive Governments, both at home and in India. When Dr. Robertson was caught at Chitral, in pursuance of this accepted policy, the right hon. gentleman very properly ordered a large force to his relief; and I entirely agree with the right hon. gentleman that it is a matter of national congratulation that such heroic tenacity was shown by the troops, and that the siege was raised with such dash and daring. (Cheers.) Chitral was relieved on April 20. What correspondence took place between the Secretary of State and the Indian Government? On March 30 the Secretary of State telegraphed to the Viceroy impressing upon him the necessity of doing nothing which in any way could commit him to any future policy. He said:—"As soon as present trouble is over, policy with regard to Chitral and neighbourhood will have to be fully and carefully reconsidered in light of recent events. Meantime, our hands should be kept perfectly free. I hope, therefore, that you will take care that nothing is said or done to commit Government either way, with regard to making new roads, or retention of posts now occupied, or occupation of new posts." Later on he telegraphed again. He asked for further information, and the Viceroy very properly replied:—"We have discussed Chitral policy, with reference to your telegram of March 30. Until we have ascertained what has happened in Chitral since Robertson was shut up we cannot arrive at a final conclusion as to policy." That was a very natural conclusion. The Secretary of State telegraphed to the Viceroy on April 19, pressing him again for further information. That was the day before the seige was raised. The Viceroy replied:—"Our views as to the importance of Chitral are expressed in our telegram of 18th, but without entering into negotiations with tribes I cannot answer as to cost of road from Peshawar, or extent of political difficulties." On the 25th the Secretary of State pressed the Viceroy to send his policy, and the Viceroy replied:—"Narrative of events indicates withdrawal under present circumstances impossible, as it would leave country to complete anarchy, and would render a settlement more difficult. In our opinion we must also keep open the road from Peshawar for some time, probably three or four months at least, whatever the ultimate decision may be." On May 8th the Indian Government, in response to the instructions received from the Secretary of State, wrote at length their views. Chitral had only just been relieved, and I doubt whether they had had any direct personal communication with any officials there, so that they were very much in the dark as to what the consequences of their policy might be, but they were absolutely unanimous in recommending the retention of Chitral. (Cheers.) Indian Finance has passed through a very severe ordeal, and yet the Indian Finance Minister, who is an exceptionally strong Minister, signed that Dispatch. The Indian Government were compelled to represent their views before they had definite information, but they warned the Secretary of State that it was possible the expenditure might be very great. They say: "What must be faced is a consideration of the means whereby we can maintain a sufficient military occupation of the Chitral Valley. The length of time occupied and the difficulty incurred in sending troops and supplies by way of Kashmir and Gilghit, and the expense of doing so are so great, that some of us would prefer to abandon all attempts to occupy Chitral rather than try to hold it by so precarious a thread. The alternative is to establish communication from the Peshawar border. The expense of doing so may be prohibitive." They go on to say: "We are not convinced, however, that these difficulties will occur." In the same despatch they state that this proposal may involve a heavy increase of expenditure, but that it may be possible to lessen these objections. It is clear to anybody who reads the Dispatch by the light of recent telegrams that this was a preliminary statement of policy extracted from the Indian Government by the orders of the Secretary of State. But Her Majesty's then Government immediately pounced upon this, and, after a very few days' consideration, sent a peremptory order to the Indian Government to reverse this policy, and then they added: "As regards Chitral State they request that, in view of the decisions above stated, you will telegraph what are the arrangements which you would recommend for the future." On June 22nd these alternative arrangements which the Home Government directed the Indian Government to send arrived, and on that day the late Ministry resigned. They never considered the alternative proposals in any shape or form, and I contend it is ridiculous for any Government, or any body of responsible men, to pretend that they have settled a difficult question by vetoing the only workmanlike proposal put forward without ever considering the alternatives. (Cheers.) Under these circumstances, we had to reconsider the position. I agree entirely with the right hon. gentleman that financial considerations are of the utmost importance at the present moment. I go so far as to say that, in my judgment, and I dare say the hon. member for Cardiff will agree with me, no external policy however bold, and no frontier performance however heroic, can compensate for the permanent annual deficiency in the Indian Exchequer. I believe that the constantly increasing taxation is a serious danger to the stability of the Indian Government, and, therefore, I looked with great apprehension on the words that the Indian Government used in which they admitted that their proposals might be prohibitive by reason of the expenditure involved. I consequently endeavoured to see whether it was possible in any way to gain time, in order to hit upon any compromise or do something which would prevent us arriving at an irrevocable decision to retire from Chitral and not make the road. The House will see that whatever decision was arrived at, would be more or less binding for years to come. It was difficult to retire from Chitral, although we had only been connected with it for some three years; and if we had decided to remain there we should have to do so for a long time to come. On the other hand, if we retired and did not make this road we should possibly never get so favourable an opportunity again of constructing this line of communication, and our retirement would probably be final. Looking to the issues raised and the grave consideration attached to them, it was essential we should have time. Her Majesty's late advisers also spoke of the unanimous decision of the Cabinet. The word "unanimous" is a new epithet in connection with Cabinet decisions, and I think it is an unfortunate one, because if you state the occasions on which the Cabinet is unanimous you are bound to state those on which the Cabinet is not unanimous. My impression is that the late Prime Minister on more than one occasion alluded to the unanimity of the late Cabinet, I suppose because it was so remarkable an event in their career that it was necessary to mention it. (Laughter.) Time, therefore, was a very essential consideration. In the Cabinet to which I have the honour to belong there are no fewer than three ex-Secretaries of State for India, and we have the advantage of the presence of Lord Lansdowne, the late Viceroy, who, I should say, is the highest living authority in this country on questions of this kind. He has visited Kashmir, is conversant with every detail of this policy, and he was of great assistance to me in examining it. I wonder if the late Government at all realise what the evacuation of Chitral would have meant? In the first place, it is perfectly clear if we abandoned Chitral we should in all probability be obliged to abandon Gilghit. Gilghit is most expensive, since, as the valley in which it is situated cannot sustain the garrison, the cost of bringing supplies from Kashmir is very heavy. If we abandoned Chitral the cost of maintaining Gilghit would be the same as before, although our main object in maintaining it would have gone. The difficulties did not end there. The right hon. gentleman described the condition of Chitral before we went there as one of dynastic murder and civil war. That would be the condition of Chitral if we left. (Hear, hear.) He laid stress on the fact that we had arrived at an arrangement with the Russian Government by which the frontier had been delimited between ourselves and that Power. I look upon that delimitation from a different point of view to the right hon. gentleman. I believe that, wherever these frontier arrangements are made, they can only be satisfactorily maintained on the distinct understanding that within each area allotted to the respective Powers, each Power will do its utmost to prevent anarchy, disorder and disturbance. If anarchy and disorder commence on one side of the frontier, they are not unlikely to extend to the other side. Nobody can deny that if we had left Chitral we should have lighted a fire there which would be unlimited in the extent of the area over which it might spread. The mere fact of our retiring before the face of the whole world and admitting that we were unable to perform the duties we had practically undertaken would have been an invitation to the neighbouring Power to step in and perform the duties we had abandoned. (Hear, hear.) Take an ordinary case in life. If one of the occupiers of two neighbouring houses chooses to go away and leave a fire smouldering which may burn down the premises of his neighbour, that neighbour has a right to come in and extinguish the fire which is the source of danger. Therefore, if we had abandoned Chitral with a certain knowledge of the disturbances which our retirement would cause, we should have been doing our very best to upset the frontier arrangement which had been arrived at. I agree with the right hon. gentleman on one point only. I do not think Chitral is of so great strategical importance as some eminent military men consider. I admit that the honours on that point must be divided. I think that considerations of a moral rather than a strategical character force us to remain. I agree that, where you have a great area to defend and only a limited number of troops to protect your frontier, it is unwise to lock up your men in out-of-the-way places. Mobility and concentration are the two great ideas which should be aimed at. The right hon. gentleman seems to think that our occupation of Chitral would necessitate an enormous strain upon our military resources. The curious thing is that, whilst the right hon. gentleman complains of the want of information, one of the cardinal and vital pieces of information, the telegram of the Indian Government on this point is the one which he shirks. It is very easy to exaggerate the dangers attending any course. The right hon. gentleman seems to think there will be a large number of troops required at Chitral. But the Indian Government point out that they require no addition to the Indian army, and show that there will be practically no troops in the intervening districts. In the same way the right hon. gentleman seemed to think that the occupation of Chitral would necessitate enormous financial outlay. Somebody told Sir Alfred Lyall it would cost half-a-million to make the road, and the right hon. gentleman flourishes half-a-million before the House. The difference between the actual facts and the excited imagination of the right hon. gentleman is shown by a telegram which has just arrived, stating that the total amount would be 20 lakhs of rupees, or, turned into sterling, £13,000, of which one-fifth would go to permanent works. I cannot help thinking that the late Government were so anxious to get out of Chitral that they did not want to be accurately informed on these points.

Hon. Members: Surely your figure is wrong.

Lord **George Hamilton**: What did I say?

Sir W. **Harcourt**: You said £13,000.

Lord **George Hamilton**: Oh! it should be £130,000. (Oh!) There is an enormous disproportion between this figure and the half-million estimate of the right hon. gentleman, which was for making the road alone, whereas of the £130,000 one fifth is for a permanent building. The most serious part of the speech of the right hon. gentleman was his indictment of the Indian Government with reference to the Proclamation. I cannot understand how anybody holding the views of the right hon. gentleman can be content with simply making a speech and moving no resolution. (Hear, hear.) If Lord Elgin cannot interpret his own Proclamation, if he is going dishonourably to break the terms of it, he is unfit to be Viceroy of India. (Cheers.) I do not think it fair to come forward and talk about honourable adherence to engagements, and not put your charge in such definite shape that the Viceroy can meet it. (Hear, hear.) Lord Elgin framed that Proclamation and the Indian Government have interpreted it, and from first to last they have contended that it is no obstacle whatever to the course they propose. (Cheers.) Then the right hon. gentleman, not content with exaggerating the cost of the road, says that the whole country through which the road passes must be annexed and subjugated to English rule; and he assumes that this will be done at the point of the bayonet, contrary to the wishes of the tribes. The truth rather is that the tribes are ready to fall in with the arrangements proposed. They are glad to get the money, and my belief is that the fruit of the expedition will be to induce the people to adopt more regular habits. I could not help smiling when I heard the right hon. gentleman denounce the construction of roads. Why, 150 years ago he would have used exactly the same arguments against opening up the Highlands. (Laughter.) The position was exactly the same, and if every successive Parliament had taken the view he now advocates the Highlands would have been to this day an isolated and inaccessible part of the United Kingdom. I believe this road, if the negotiations are properly conducted, will place our relations with the tribes on a better footing than before. Now, I think I have answered the main points of the right hon. gentleman's indictment. I have shown that he has enormously overrated the calls upon our resources which the occupation of Chitral will entail: and I have shown that he has systematically disregarded the advice of the Indian Government in this matter. I should like to add just one word on the right hon. gentleman's references to economy. In my judgment, economy does not consist merely in stopping useless expenditure, but it consists also in getting a good return for expenditure already sanctioned and incurred. The right hon. gentleman was forced to sanction this expedition to Chitral. The valour, determination and endurance of our soldiers accomplished great feats, and have immensely raised our prestige in that country. Why then throw away all the fruits of the expedition? (Hear, hear.) It seems just as much the act of a spendthrift to throw away the legitimate consequences of a very large and necessary expenditure as to incur wholly useless and unnecessary expenditure. (Hear, hear.) But whilst I approve strongly of the proposals of the Indian Government, I have no desire whatever to embark on a frontier policy of enterprise, or of annexing all those territories to which the hon. member for Cardiff alluded. On the contrary, I believe we have now arrived at a settlement of our Indian frontier difficulties. We have, I think, by the arrangements sanctioned, utilised the results of the Chitral expedition, and my one wish now is, looking to the condition of Indian finance, to associate with the satisfactory settlement of those frontier questions a period of quietude and economy. (Cheers.)

SPEECH BY SIR W. HARCOURT.

Sir W. Harcourt: My right hon. friend the member for Wolverhampton, in his powerful speech, had two objects in his plan. First of all, he had to establish that the policy which the late Government pursued was one which, in the circumstances under which they were placed, and with the information in their possession, was a sound and wise policy. I believe his speech established that proposition beyond dispute. They had to come to a determination, and that determination was come to on the information furnished to them by the Indian Government in their despatch of May 8. I do not understand what the noble lord means by the charge that we rather forced the Indian Government to give an opinion upon this subject. Why, the Indian Government, after the success of the expedition to Chitral, had to consider what was next to be done, and they laid their views before the Government at home in the despatch mentioned. Of course there was a question of finance. Everybody knows that in those short weeks there was an expenditure of something like one-and-a-half millions of money, and that every week meant an expenditure of thousands and tens of thousands; and in the present condition of Indian finance it was of the first importance that the Government at home should determine whether or not they were going to continue that expenditure. Therefore it was the duty of the Government of India immediately to report, and it was the duty of the Government at home, without any unnecessary delay, to come to a determination upon such report. If they determined that the expenditure should not continue upon that scale, it was their duty at the earliest moment to inform the Indian Government of their decision. Therefore I must say I entirely dissent from the tone of the observations of the noble lord, in which he seems to assume that the late Government unduly pressed the Government of India in the matter. Now, my right hon. friend has already laid before the House what was the character of the report of the Government of India. I at once accept the proposition that the question of this road is really the deciding question. Therefore the argument does not depend upon the policy of making this road. The Government of India, on May 8, told us they were perfectly conscious that the course they recommended might involve the Government in an expense which the finances of India could ill afford. They were perfectly conscious of that. The noble lord, on the other hand, enters upon this expenditure with a light heart, and that is because he has a peculiar measure of the value of a lakh of rupees. I do not wonder that he thinks the road a very cheap undertaking. We, on the other hand, being under the impression that a lakh at par is £10,000, were not able to understand how 20 lakhs of rupees amount only to £13,000. There are many county councils in England which would be extremely glad to make a road of 180 miles for £13,000. I know that in the county in which I reside roads cost more per mile than the roads over those great passes, according to the estimate of the Secretary of State, who is so careful about financial waste. Such, then, was the plan which was laid before the late Government by the Government of India. Taking that into account, and all the political considerations to which my right hon. friend has referred, the late Government thought they were not justified in countenancing or authorising the plan proposed by the Government of India. It is a remarkable fact that when this question first arose under the present Government the Leader of the House stated that new information had come to the present Government which had altered the whole position from that in which the late Government found themselves. Well, that is an indication that he thought the decision which the late Government arrived at on the information in their possession had not been altogether a wrong one, and he laid as the foundation of his case for altering that policy the subsequent information received. Now, what I desire to do is to examine what that subsequent information was, and how it has really altered the situation. The question is, as I said before, was this road, and is this road, a thing which ought to be made with a view to the occupation of Chitral? It is said that it is a very serious thing to come into conflict with the Government of India upon a subject of that kind. Yes; but English Governments have come into conflict with Indian Governments before now—(hear, hear)—as, for example, on the question of Kandahar. No one who heard it at the time will have forgotten the great speech made by Lord Hartington, defending the evacuation of Kandahar against the opinion of the Government of India; and is there any man connected with the Government of India now who regrets that decision? (Hear, hear.) Would it have been a wise thing in reference to our subsequent Afghan policy to have maintained the occupation of Kandahar? The opinion of every man connected with the Government in England and in India is that the evacuation of Kandahar was a wise and judicious policy. But let us consider the circumstances which Her Majesty's present advisers consider have altered the situation. They telegraphed to the Government of India to give them information as to what they thought could be done in reference to this road, which they regard as the critical part of the question, and they received an answer, I think on August 3, in a despatch to which the noble lord refers, and of which he complains that my right hon. friend did not read it at length. It is not necessary to read it at length, because the whole of this information, which the noble Lord says changed the policy of the Government, is entirely hypothesis and surmise. The Government of India wished to enter into negotiations with the tribes in reference to the road, and my right hon. friend did not object to that, and gave the Government of India leave to enter into negotiations. But there have been no negotiations; all that is said is that the tribes have been "sounded." I think that is the expression, or, at all events, that is all that has taken place, and it is surmised that the tribes may be friendly in regard to this road. Now, two or three years ago such an opinion would have been expressed in regard to Umra Khan; but what happened? There were wars of succession such as made up so much of the history of Eastern States, and tribes which are friendly to-day become our enemies to-morrow. The extraordinary fickleness of these people is admitted by Dr. Robertson. Therefore, the mere surmise that probably the tribes, or a set of tribes, may be friendly is most unsafe ground to go upon. It is a very curious thing, now that it is assumed that these tribes are friendly, that I read yesterday in the *Times* a telegram as to the attitude of these tribes at this time. It is dated Laram, and is headed, "The Retention of Chitral." It speaks of the withdrawal of a part of the force from Chitral. It says the garrison of Chitral, consisting of the 3rd Goorkhas, the 25th Punjab Infantry, and so forth, and that the 3rd Brigade under General Gatacre is beginning to withdraw; and then it proceeds: "It is apparent that a withdrawal of 10,000 men in the face of tribes who, though at present peaceful, would spring to arms on the smallest pretext, is a problem of no little difficulty, and one which requires great skill, patience and adroit manœuvre." Therefore, at the present time, when the tribes are under the influence of our victories, and while there is a great body of our troops there, the withdrawal of 10,000 troops from the midst of these tribes is beset with danger. They are peaceful to-day, but they may be our enemies to-morrow. Through this country you propose to make a road of 180 miles, and by this means you rely on a peaceful occupation. Then the telegram proceeds: "The evacuation of the Jandol Valley was most skilfully accomplished without a shot being fired, and the successful carrying out of that difficult operation gives reasonable hope that the withdrawal from the line of the Panjkora river will be equally successful." This shows that no reliance can possibly be placed on the permanent peaceableness of these tribes. My right hon. friend has said, and it seems to me to stand to reason, that, if you are to rely on these peaceable tribes for your road, if the tribes cease to be peaceable you will have to subdue them by force and so occupy your road. Now, the noble lord in his despatch uses these words: "It was apparent from your letter of May 8, that your Government was not without apprehension that the task of opening up this road might, if it were to necessitate the military coercion of the tribes and the interference with their independence, be one of such great cost and involving such embarrassing complications as to render it of doubtful expediency: but in your opinion this question, both in its financial and political aspects, depended on the attitude which might be assumed by the tribes, and you indicated that if amicable arrangements could be secured and they could be persuaded to become responsible for the safety of the road, the cost need not be prohibitive." What, then, is the condition of the occupation of Chitral? That the tribes become guarantee for the security of the road. But how can you rely on these tribes? The noble lord continues:—"But your information is still incomplete as to the exact cost of the scheme, and I felt some doubts as to the absolute necessity of permanently maintaining regular troops on the Malakand Pass, and as to whether the tribes would see in this an infringement of the Proclamation." The Government of India sent proposals that, in addition to the tribes, there should be quartered on the road three regiments and a battery, and, of course, the tribes would see an infringement of the Proclamation in the quartering of these troops in their midst. The noble lord, then, was perfectly right in telling the Government of India he had doubts on the point. But how is this road going to be kept? By native levies? If the road is attacked you must defend it, and this road of 180 miles is in charge of native levies and of tribes not to be depended upon from month to month, or, indeed, from day to day. If the tribes do not choose to defend the road, and regard it as a menace to their independence, what becomes of your Proclamation? This is where the moral consideration to which my right hon. friend referred comes in with enormous force; it deprives you of the power of really defending the road on which the occupation of Chitral must depend, because you cannot use force to defend the road, having given an undertaking. So, then, you go to the expense of making a road, and have no security for the safety of it when made. Chitral, then, will be held under a sort of tenancy at will, a tenancy dependent on the will of the tribes along the road. I cannot conceive a more insecure tenancy. Where in any other part of the frontier do you hold a road on such terms? But this is what you declare in your Proclamation, and that, I suppose, is what the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs meant in his allusion, for he must have seen that the use of the road depends on the goodwill of wild and fickle tribes, and there is no security of occupation. Then the noble lord says:—"The Governmant of India say it will cost nothing, that it will lead to no increase of the Indian army." Has the Government of India never been mistaken on that subject before? Did they not give assurances that the expedition to Afghanistan was to cost one-and-a-half millions? It cost, I believe, 22 millions. I have never known a single case in which the estimates made by the Indian Government have not been proved to be greatly and disastrously below the mark. I was glad to hear the noble Lord express his strong sense of the impolicy of loading India with additional expenditure. I was very glad to hear him say that the discontent which might be produced in India by additional taxation would be a far greater danger to India herself than any she has to fear from attacks upon her frontier by foreign nations. The great thing you have to fear is that you shall create discontent among the people of India. As long as you have the people of India your friends, satisfied with the justice and policy of your rule, your empire there will be safe. You may rely on your army, which has shown upon a recent occasion its vigour, its valour, its indomitable pluck—(cheers)—but if you have that army on the frontier of a people which you are oppressing by taxation which they are unable to bear, you will have behind you and upon your communications a far greater peril than any which you apprehend, and for which you are making advances of this character. I read in this dispatch that the noble Lord is not satisfied with the information he has yet received. He charges us with making up our minds upon information that was incomplete. Well, he cannot have made up his mind, for in the very last paragraph he says the information is still incomplete. How, then, can he have made up his mind as to the course we are pursuing in the circumstances? It is quite plain that he has not accepted the plan laid before him by the Government of India. I do hope that before the country is finally committed to a course which I believe will be highly injurious to the finances of India, and, so far from giving strength to your frontier defence, will only weaken it, the Government at home will require much fuller information as to the cost of this expedition, and as to the situation in which we stand with reference to these tribes. It is upon our situation in reference to these tribes that the matter must be judged, and I do hope that, before the country is committed to a policy of this gravity, we may have much more satisfactory information than any which the Government is thinking of acting upon, and upon which, as it appears to me from the dispatch of the noble lord himself, he has not finally made up his mind.

Sir C. DILKE said he should not have risen to address the House, had it not been for the direct allusion to himself in the speech of the right hon. gentleman who brought the subject before the House. He might express his regret that there should not have been a motion made. The right hon. gentleman had put a motion on the paper, and so excluded other motions, and then did not move it. He thought that was to be regretted, so far as the course of public debate was concerned. The hon. member for Cardiff and his seconder seemed to him to have placed their motion on the paper for the purpose of preventing some other subject coming on. Indeed, the seconder actually spoke against the terms of the motion itself so far as he understood them. The hon. member for Bethnal Green said that he was in favour of the annexation of Chitral, and on the merits of this case he held diametrically opposite views to the proposer of the motion. He should not have alluded to these two hon. members or their speeches but for the fact that the hon. member for Cardiff had introduced into the debate statements which showed so imperfect an acquaintance with the whole subject that he was afraid he had misled the House of Commons. The hon. gentleman repeatedly alluded to the fortification of the passes leading into India as the particular policy he condemned. There was not a single one of these passes fortified with the exception of the Khyber Pass, which was only slightly fortified against infantry. He thought his right hon. friend had enormously exaggerated the difficulty and danger of making roads between the political and administrative frontier of India. It was quite possible that the road now in question might be a difficult road to make and hold; but it was equally possible that that might not be the case. Roads had been made outside the political frontier of India over hundreds of miles of territory, and the making of them had been absolutely justified by what had followed. He did not wish to express any confident opinion upon the policy of holding this country; all that he wished to argue was that with regard to the road as it stood, it was quite possible, without any actual war or any great military cantonment, to keep it open, for the natives might be willing to do so for their own sake. The position of the Government was that the road was to be held by tribal levies without anything being done to infringe the Proclamation. His right hon. friend had referred to the frontier of India, and he condemned in strong language indeed going beyond the frontier; and he used the term annexation, which was also employed by the Member for Cardiff. His right hon. friend, in giving the history of Chitral, showed that long ago it came under British influence. When in 1881 it was proposed to withdraw the Agency, doubt was expressed as to whether it was safe, but it was laid down that the withdrawal made no change in the policy with regard to Chitral. They had admitted that Chitral became a feudatory State, and they had given money help. Mr. Gladstone's first Government in 1880 endorsed that view. In 1892 the Member for Wolverhampton and the Leader of the Opposition agreed to increase our Chitral subsidy; all through, down to the recent action of the late Government, successive Governments invariably followed the opinion of the Government of India. They never attempted to over-rule it. Then there came a very sudden change, and it was upon that that he justified the interruption which he had made. The late Government acted very rapidly upon the despatch of the 9th of May. They must have received it during the Whitsuntide holidays, and then, after a few days, on the 13th June, they reversed the unanimous opinion of the Government of India—the first time that that opinion had been departed from in Chitral questions. The right hon. gentleman had taken the opinion of great military authorities, no doubt, for there was on the other side the opinion of Sir Donald Stewart. He asked the attention of the House to the very sharp point of controversy between himself and the right hon. Member for Wolverhampton. What was the principle at issue when they reversed or accepted the opinion of the Government of India? The Duke of Argyll, in his famous despatch—twice laid on the Table of the House—had always been taken as a masterpiece on that subject. It expressed the constitutional view on this question. The despatch laid it down:—"Such powers of control as are claimed for the Secretary of State must be used with great deliberation, and on the rarest occasions." The Duke was then in Mr. Gladstone's Administration. These words were taken note of by the Government of India, and accepted. What he wanted to know was whether this principle was applied in the Chitral case. He had not forgotten the Kandahar case, but in that case the Government of India were not unanimous. There were two questions there. There was the question whether we should hold Kandahar and the Pishin Valley, or whether we should hold the Pishin Valley without Kandahar. They had three Members of the Council in India with them on that question, the Viceroy, the Military Member of the Council, and the Finance Member of the Council, such weighty names that they finally very largely overcame the opposition towards them. The Finance Member at that time was Major Baring.

Sir H. **Fowler** said the Finance Member of Council was Sir John Strachey.

Sir C. **Dilke** said, at the time he spoke of, Major Baring, now Lord Cromer, was the Finance Member. Those were very weighty names, and they had against them other less weighty names. But what did they do? They argued with them for months and months, and finally yielded to them on the Pishin portion of the case, and by doing that they carried a not very unwilling dissent from those members of the Council who had been opposed to them with regard to Kandahar. For two years they agreed to stay temporarily in Pishin, and then ended by staying there altogether. That was what he called "great deliberation," a deliberation which had been entirely lacking on the present occasion. He was one of those who believed that it was not by over-ruling the Government of India from time to time upon some question of frontier policy, but by considering larger changes of policy, that they should be able to bring the finances of India into order. The hon. member for Cardiff thought that annexations were the main cause of the difficulties of Indian finance; there were others who ascribed them to the complications with silver which had arisen in modern times. The hon. member for Bethnal Green appeared to share the views of the Government with regard to this particular annexation, as he called it. He, himself, should not call it by that name, but, at all events, there was, common to the mover and seconder of this resolution, and common also to a larger number of members of that House, a very uneasy feeling in regard to the condition of Indian affairs. He believed there was much to be done in the way of civil economy and civil reform in India, but apart from that question, he contended they would never deal adequately with this question of military expenditure of India until they radically revised the whole of their military system. They had an expensive system of white army, and they would have to alter it into a cheaper system of white army before they could make both ends meet.

Sir W. **Wedderburn** regretted that the Papers relating to Chitral had not been published earlier. The right hon. Member for Wolverhampton complained that the Blue-book did not contain all the necessary Papers, but the late Government had had it in their power to publish all the Papers and Documents at an earlier stage, and that he thought would have been a right and proper course to take. If the case had been put before the public, the late Government would have received a great deal of support in the decision at which they ultimately arrived. As regarded that decision, he entirely concurred in the views that the late Government took. He thanked the right hon. gentleman for the way in which he had sought to raise this question from one of mere temporary expediency, or financial consideration, to a higher level. He should be prepared to vote with his hon. friend the Member for Cardiff upon the Amendment, because it covered the ground occupied by the Chitral question, as well as many other similar questions. The hon. member for Bethnal Green had seconded the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cardiff, but he regretted that the hon. member's reasons were, as he stated them, opposed to the whole educated opinion of India. He was sorry that Mr. Naoroji had not been returned to the House, as he could speak more authoritatively on behalf of the Indian people. In that discussion the opinion of the people of India was a very important element. He trusted the public opinion of this country would insist that the question should be looked at from a broader and higher point of view, and that they would consider whether this aggression upon our weaker neighbours in India—this forward policy, as it was called—was right and just. We had no quarrel with these people, and we had no right to deprive them of their land and liberty. He thought that a black man was as much entitled to his life, liberty, and property as a white man. To the ordinary man, the terms of our Proclamation to the frontier tribes conveyed the idea that we only intended to enter that country for the purpose of relieving Dr. Robertson, and that we would not interfere with the independence and liberty of any of the tribes there. He did not care who were the people who upheld the present action. It was a clear breach of faith, for which, primarily, Ministers were responsible, and they must take the responsibility, and could not put it off on Lord Elgin or anyone else. Then, as regarded the grounds upon which the present forward movement had been justified, the Leader of the House placed it on two main grounds. One was the question of prestige; the right hon. gentleman said that if we abandoned any territories that we had once occupied we should strike a blow at our prestige. He thought that his right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton (Sir Henry Fowler) very rightly objected to that word as being a governing rule for our action. What did the word "prestige" mean? Dr. Johnson had said that it was the Latin for "a lie." In a dictionary which he had consulted, he found the first meaning to be "illusion," that meant self-deception; and the last meaning given was "imposture," that meant the deceiving of others. He left the Government to choose which of the two meanings they would adopt. The second reason given by the Leader of the House was that, from a financial point of view, it would cost us little or nothing, and he said that he had had assurance from the Government of India that the expenditure would not be very large. This information which was now represented as justifying the change of policy turned out to be simply a statement of the political officers, to the effect that the tribes would agree to let this road pass through their territories. He did not think that anyone who had studied these matters would be impressed with the correctness of the information obtained by the political officers on the frontier. Really, by far the best way of getting reliable information was the old method of placing a native agent in these border places. He was a Muhammadan, generally of priestly position. He could mingle with the people, and could give exact information upon all border questions, without raising the same suspicion or prejudice that a European officer raised; and he was able to live there without creating disturbances or rivalries among the different claimants for the throne, or those who advocated different policies. The native agents did not get us into the difficulties that Dr. Robertson brought about in the case of Chitral. Anybody reading the Blue-book would see what a humiliating position we were placed in through the interference of the British officer who carried with him all the authority of the British Government. As regarded the cost, the estimates were quite untrustworthy, and this had been the case in the Afghan War of 1877 and the Abyssinian War. It was remarkable that the occupation of Chitral should be advocated on the ground that it continued the policy of Lord Lytton in 1878, which had brought us so much disaster, loss, and disgrace. Lord Lawrence's policy, on the other hand, was based on experience and common sense. He said that Nature had given us a strong rampart of rock, and mountains, and torrents, and that we should maintain those natural boundaries. Nature had also provided volunteers to man those ramparts in the native tribes, who hated foreign interference of any kind. It was just the same as if a farmer had a thick, thorny hedge round his orchard. He would be very foolish if he were to remove those thorns and briars, and still more foolish if he were to spend his substance in cutting a hole through that hedge and let the thieves through to steal his fruit. If we made this road fit for artillery, though he was not an alarmist, he must say that we were just paving the way for a Russian invasion. That was mere common sense, and that was the view which Lord Roberts held in 1880, when he was responsible for the defence of India. The noble Lord then held that, the longer and more difficult the road along which an enemy must approach through the mountain passes was, the better it would be for the defence, and that, so far from shortening such a road by a single mile or rendering it easier, he would prefer to lengthen the road and to increase the difficulties of it. That was the opinion of Lord Roberts at that time, and the noble Lord had not written or said anything since that detracted in any way from the force of that statement. The noble Lord had certainly written a letter to the *Times*, in which he said that the defence of such a road would depend very much upon the friendly feeling of the tribes to our Government. Was it not a curious way of gaining their friendship to rob them of the independence which they valued so highly? Dr. Leitner, a gentleman who was well acquainted with the state of feeling that existed among the mountain tribes on our Indian frontier had well said that they always regarded the first invaders as their enemies, and the second invaders as their deliverers. The proper course for us to take in the matter was to leave the native tribes alone, and to persuade them that we did not want their country because we did not think it worth taking, and then they would regard us as their best friends, and if any pressure were put upon them by either Russia or the Amír, they would at once throw themselves into our arms. That was the policy that had been pursued by Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo, Lord Northbrook and Lord Ripon, and it was only set aside by Lord Lytton. They ought to return to the well-tried system, which had been found both effective and economical. By pursuing an opposite policy we should suffer loss of reputation for good faith, we should meet with great financial difficulties, and we should cause great dissatisfaction among the people of India. As regarded the financial question involved in the imposition of the Indian cotton import duties, he hoped that the hon. Members from Lancashire would carefully examine into the matter, because, if a policy of annexation were to be pursued, those duties might, in all probability, have to be raised from five to ten per cent. Such a policy was unjust, because under it the tribes would be deprived of their lands and liberties. Moreover, to follow such a policy would be an act of bad faith, because all those people were deliberately informed that we only intended to remain in their country until our immediate purpose was fulfilled. Such a policy would be ruinous both politically and financially, while the people of India would see money spent in a needless way, and would see no hope of ever getting the taxation which pressed so heavily upon the poor of the country lightened, or applied to those purposes of improvement and advancement which we were so anxious to see carried into effect. He, therefore, fully approved of the policy of the late Government in reference to this question. He believed that the policy which was good then was good now, and that so far from any change in the circumstances of India having occurred which would make the policy less successful, everything tended to show that it would be more effective than ever. The fact that the boundaries of India had been delimited on the frontiers of Russia and of the Amír's country ought to induce us to return to the good, old, and humane policy which had given India a full treasury, and friendly neighbours on the frontiers, and a contented people at home.

Sir **ANDREW SCOBLE** said, that having been a member of the Government of India at the time when the Gilghit Agency was re-established in 1889, he hoped that the House would permit him to make some observations. The right hon. gentlemen the late Secretary for India had said that in going to Chitral we were going beyond the boundaries of India; but the right hon. gentleman appeared to forget that there was not only a British India, but the India of which Her Majesty was Empress and over which she exercised political control, and that Chitral was certainly within the latter sphere. That was clearly shown by the definition of India in the Interpretation Act of 1889. The Government of India had merely discharged an imperative duty in relieving the British officers who were being besieged in Chitral, and that duty having been discharged, the only question now before the House was as to what was to be done with Chitral. It might be perfectly true that the result of our agreement with Russia as to the delimitation of the Pamir frontier would render it improbable that Russia will give us any trouble in that quarter of the globe, but we must not overlook the fact that no longer ago than 1878 Russia had set troops in motion by the Pamir route with the avowed intention of stirring up the tribes of the Hindu Kush so as to cause trouble on the Peshawar border. The march of these troops was only stopped by the treaty of Berlin. What had happened before might happen again. It therefore appeared to him that the Indian Government were perfectly right in taking steps to secure our frontier in that direction. He submitted that we had good reasons for retaining our hold on Chitral. It had been assumed that the Indian Government intended to annex Chitral; but so far as he could gather it had never entered into the minds of anyone connected with the Government of India to annex that country. It seemed to be thought there could not be a military occupation, temporary or permanent in any part of India unless there was annexation. There were military occupations in various parts of the country, but the native chiefs did not consider themselves annexed because there was a British force cantoned in their territory. It was said we were going to force on the tribes a mountain road to Chitral. The correspondence contained no evidence of any such intention; on the contrary, it appeared that there was every probability of a peaceful arrangement for the road being made. Experience showed that the tribes might be trusted as guarantors for the security of such roads. In Beluchistan there was not only a road, but a railroad, under the protection of the tribes through which it passed. On the facts he failed to see what objection there could be to the course the Government proposed to pursue. It was unfortunate that the question of Chitral should have been mixed up with the wider question raised by the hon. member for Cardiff. In the last Parliament they had sad experiences of the result of academic Resolutions passed by the House, such as those on the system of examinations for the Indian Civil Service and the opium traffic. The latter resulted in the appointment of a Commission which entirely destroyed the case of the anti-opiumists. He hoped the House would not accept the Resolution of the hon. member for Cardiff. So far as its principle went there was no great objection to it, but he feared it would cause embarrassment in time to come. (Cheers.)

Sir H. FOWLER: I will not attempt to make another speech, but there are one or two personal explanations due to myself and the Government of India which I wish to make to prevent misconception. The right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean complained of the want of deliberation that the late Government appeared to have shown in coming to a decision on the question. He seemed to be under the impression that the dispatch sent on May 8, and received towards the end of the month, was answered off hand on June 13 by telegram. No one knows better than the right hon. baronet that a large number of communications are being constantly received in London from India. On April 18 I was perfectly aware what the policy of the Government of India was. On May 9—the day after the dispatch—I received a private telegram telling me what the effect of the dispatch was. On May 27 the Government of India pressed me to indicate what the Cabinet intended to do, and on June 5 for the decision of the Cabinet; and whether our decision is right or wrong, no Government ever made a more careful examination of the papers before giving a decision than the late Government, whose decision I sent by telegram. If we had not left office I should have sent a dispatch in a few days fully explaining the question. Another misconception I am perhaps to blame for. The noble Lord opposite thinks I have cast a reflection on the Government of India with reference to the proclamation. I can assure him and the House that it was not my intention to do so. What I did was what the noble Lord said in his telegram of August 9:—"Do nothing to infringe the terms of the proclamation," and at the conclusion of the last dispatch he cautioned the Government to strictly keep to the conditions of the proclamation. I am satisfied that Lord Elgin and his colleagues had no intention to violate the terms of the proclamation. The Indian Government believe—I do not agree with them, but I will not trouble the House with the reasons why—that peaceful arrangements can be made for the construction of this road. If they are made, of course there will be no violation of the terms of the proclamation. The argument I submitted was that it was impossible to make the road by means of peaceful arrangements, and to make it without them would be annexation; but that was a question of argument, and it was not one of imputation upon Lord Elgin, for whom I have profound respect, and I hope that he and his Government will believe I had no intention to cast the slightest reflection on their good faith. I will not pursue the little personal conflict I had with my right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean. He and I were speaking of two different times. I spoke of one part of the transaction and he of another. There is no doubt that in the debate to which I referred, Mr. Gibson, now Lord Ashbourne, twitted my right hon. friend with not having told the House what the opinion of the Government was, and asserted that, with the solitary exception of Major Baring, the Indian Government opposed the evacuation of Kandahar, and Lord Hartington stated at that time that Sir Donald Stewart also opposed that policy. That is a trivial matter; but whether our position is right or wrong, I should like, in justice to my colleagues and myself, to repudiate the suggestion that it was arrived at without full consideration or in a hurried manner. The consideration of the question was going on for several weeks, and we did not arrive at our decision without the most anxious care.

The House then divided on Mr. Maclean's amendment. The numbers were—

For the amendment	28
Against	127
Majority against	109

THE INDIAN IMPORT DUTIES.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON AND LANCASHIRE.

Mr. PHILIP STANHOPE said he was sorry to have to raise, at such a late period of the Session, and in such a small House, the question of the Import Duties on Indian cotton, which was a question of the greatest importance to a large number of people in this country. If there was anything more patent than another in the late appeal to the Constituencies, it was the stern resolve of the people of Lancashire that this matter should not be allowed to sleep, but that it should be pressed again and again on the attention of Parliament if necessary. It would be remembered that, much to the surprise of the House of Commons, and certainly very much to the surprise of the Members for Lancashire, in the beginning of last year, it was announced that the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton, then Secretary for India, had yielded—he would not say to his better judgment—but to the representations made by the Indian Government, and decided, without carrying with him the sympathies of his colleagues in the Cabinet, to impose Import Duties on cotton sent to India. Unfortunately, owing to the rules of the House, the representatives of those whose interests were affected had little or no opportunity of discussing the question until it was almost, to use the words of the right hon. gentleman, "a closed question;" and the present Lord James, then the representative of an important Lancashire Constituency, had, on the 21st February, to move the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to it. An important and interesting debate followed. He ventured to say that the arguments against the imposition of the duties were not exhausted in that debate, and that the eloquence and the admirable flights of patriotism in which the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton indulged, did not deal with the commercial aspects of the question. The Motion against the duties was rejected, much to the disappointment of those who hoped the House of Commons would take a reasonable view of the matter. On May 27th following the Debate a deputation from those interested in the cotton trade waited on the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton, and laid before the right hon. gentleman, as he himself would admit, the objections to the Duties with great force and detail. Before the right hon. gentleman could give his reply to the representatives of the deputation a general election took place, a new Government came into office, and, much to his satisfaction and to the satisfaction of every member for Lancashire, the noble lord the member for Ealing was appointed Secretary for India, because, on this question, the views of the noble lord had been consistent and straightforward since 1876. The right hon. gentleman has declared that the Import Duties on cotton goods was unjust to the consumers of India as well as to the producers of India; and that there was little or no hope of the countervailing Excise Duties fulfilling the purpose for which they were intended. Other members of the present Government also spoke in the debate of February 21st. The right hon. gentleman the member for Preston, whom he was glad to see in his present position as Secretary to the Treasury, then used the argument that while self-governing colonies, if they liked, might adopt the mistaken policy of imposing import duties, in the case of India, for whose finances this country was responsible, for the Indian Government to adopt a protective policy was inimical to the best interests of the people of India. He (Mr. Stanhope) maintained that we ought to adopt and maintain in India the policy we have adopted and maintained at home—namely, that while there might be import duties for revenue purposes upon spirits, tobacco, wines and other such articles, an article of vital necessity to the people of India, like cotton—which was used in enormous quantities by the people of India, and was practically their only attire—should be left absolutely free. Unfortunately that view did not prevail with the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton. The right hon. gentleman accepted the view of the Government of India that the import duties should be imposed on the understanding that there was an absolutely countervailing excise duty. He maintained that that excise duty was not absolutely countervailing. In the first place, it gave to the native manufacturers of India an absolute monopoly over all the lower qualities of cotton cloth. All kinds under 20 counts being absolutely free, the native manufacturers had an absolute monopoly in that production, and they were able to embark their capital with the knowledge that that monopoly could not be attacked under the present arrangements. But it was said by the Government of India that all counts under 20 were practically already a monopoly of the Indian manufacturers, and that Lancashire was unable to compete with them. That was a mistake. In an able pamphlet drawn up by Mr. Whittaker on behalf of the Joint Employers' and Workers' Committee, it was pointed out with great force that the low prices, and possibly lower prices of American cotton, made it possible for Lancashire to compete even in these lower counts, and that Lancashire, with the energy she generally shows in such matters, would probably embark on such competition, were it not that the present countervailing cotton duty practically created a monopoly for the Indian manufacturer. The next point was that there should be on the one hand a 5 per cent. *ad valorem* duty on imported cloth, and, on the other hand, there should only be a 5 per cent. duty on the yarn in India. It had been pointed out that the yarn was the only cost in the cloth. No doubt it formed by far the greater portion of the cost. Let them assume that the yarn was 70 per cent. of the actual cost of the cloth. That meant that the manufacturer in India practically only paid 70 per cent. of the duty paid by his competitor in Lancashire. It was argued that they had to pay more for machinery and coal, and that consequently they ought to enjoy the advantage. But, on the other hand, the manufacturers in India had an enormous market for free labour, and they had not got Factory Bills, which, though he entirely approved of them, impeded the free working of the manufacturer. On these grounds the countervailing duty was not, and would not be, effective for the purpose which it was intended to serve. It was true that the Secretary of State had received representations sent by the Joint Committee, and that he proposed to await the answer of the Indian Government before giving a decisive reply; but from one quarter at all events he had already had his reply. In the *Times* a few days ago there was a significant telegram, which was a quotation from the *Pioneer*—one of the leading Anglo-Indian papers. These are the words:—“We are not concerned to claim undiluted unselfishness for Calcutta and Bombay, but we know a good deal more about the depth and strength of the agitation over the cotton duties than Lord George Hamilton, and if he imagines that it was the work merely of local coteries of interested merchants, he is totally and lamentably mistaken. Lord George, moreover, has apparently yet to learn the rudimentary lesson that, where questions of Indian finance are concerned, even the shrieking units of society in the Europeanised communities of Bombay and Calcutta have a far better claim to be heard than the shrieking units of Manchester and Oldham. It is a mere waste of power to ask the Government of India to draw up a fresh minute on this subject. Their views have been given in the fullest and clearest manner possible, and it would be wiser for Lord Salisbury's Ministry to make up their minds at once that the cotton duties must remain.” If that was the view of Anglo-India, he was at one with that newspaper in saying that any representation we might make, by deputation or otherwise, might be ineffectual for achieving the object in view. It seemed to him that this question had yet to be fought out again and again, perhaps, in the House of Commons. It would have to be constantly debated and pressed on the attention of the House on every convenient occasion. Lancashire had been called selfish and greedy in respect of this agitation. Lancashire was nothing of the sort. Lancashire had a right to have its voice on trade questions that affected its interests so deeply. Lancashire raised this question in the interest of commercial freedom. It regarded import duties as restraints of trade, and it regarded these duties in particular as crippling a great industry. He hoped that in time members of the Government might be inclined to take a more favourable view of the matter. He was aware that in this Government, as in all Governments, there were some skeletons in the cupboard. There was, for instance, the right hon. gentleman the member for St. George's, Hanover Square, who, in the debate of the 21st February, did not share the view of the noble lord, and who made a speech of the character which he did with such adroitness and skill—a speech of a character that might be called sitting on the fence in this matter. However, he hoped the Secretary of State and the Government would understand that in raising this question the opponents of the duty were only keeping the question alive, that they meant to keep the question alive, and they meant on every convenient occasion to push the matter to a division, and to show that in this question of trade, which had so much to do with the success of the Unionist Party at the General Election—that in the question of trade, at all events, there was some interest to be shown by the Unionist Party, that they would be expected to redeem their pledges upon it. He had occasion, in the course of the election, to traverse Lancashire from end to end, and he averred that there was no place in Lancashire, county or borough, the walls of which were not plastered with enormous bills calling upon the electors to vote for So-and-so and the repeal of the cotton duties. (A cry of “No.”) He was sorry the hon. member who cried “No,” and who represented a seaside constituency, had not a few factory operatives in his constituency to awaken his conscience in the matter. He believed that Lancashire members opposite, returned as they were very largely in consequence of the views they held on this matter, would assist him in keeping the Government up to the level, and in ensuring that the Government should not yield to the interested clique in India who were at the bottom of this agitation. It was said the agitation in India was purely and solely in the interest of the people of India. Towards the end of last Parliament a Report was sent containing the views of the various Chambers of Commerce in India upon the subject. The Upper India Chamber of Commerce at Cawnpur said: “Apart from the inconsistency and invidiousness of the Bill in excluding cotton goods when practically everything else consumed by the community is taxed, a further cogent argument lies in the fact that most of the articles liable to duty under the new Schedule form necessities of life to the classes who already suffer most from low exchange, and who bear the burden of the income tax and the direct and other cesses imposed by the Provincial Government. If, however, cotton goods are freed, the symmetry of the tax is at once destroyed, for these are the only commodities of foreign production used by the masses, and thus a very large section of the population would escape from contributing to the needs of the State.” That was to say, the argument on behalf of these duties was that they would fall upon the poorer classes of India, and that it was they who should be taxed to supply the needs of the Exchequer. Then there was the Calcutta Trades Association, which first of all proposed the early abolition of the income tax, and then proceeded warmly to back up the cotton duties. With regard to the income tax this association said:—“Pressing as it does chiefly upon Anglo-Indians, its retention is a perfection of cruelty.” Another Chamber of Commerce advocated the cotton duties solely to relieve the official classes from the payment of Indian taxes. Next there were the mill companies, such as the Egerton Mills Company. This is what a Mr. Gilbert said:—“It is a far cry from Bombay to Calcutta, and it seems to me Bombay is being sacrificed. At present we cannot work at a profit. The Government of India had far better say the Bombay mills should be dismantled and be honest. At present our mill interest has completely gone to ruin.” From a careful analysis of ten of the largest cotton mills in India he found that, between the beginning of April last year and the beginning of June of this year, the share capital of these companies had appreciated no less than 46 per cent. He did not know why the commercial community should at once have so hurriedly given an increased value of 46 per cent. to their shares if they did not believe that there was going to be established practically protection in the interests of the Indian millowner. Upon this subject at all events the Secretary of India was absolutely sound. He said, on the 21st of February of this year, that:—“He agreed they should listen sympathetically to the voice of India, but if they wanted to hear the view of India, Bombay and Calcutta were not the places to hear it. Those European cities did not represent India, and the peculiarity of modern India was that certain sections of those two capitals, having adopted western ideas, had developed with singular skill the methods of agitation. The result was there was no country in the world where the shrieking units of society could make themselves so well heard, and where the millions were so quiescent, as in India.” It was because the millions of India were quiescent that so many of these questions were maltreated in that House. It was because we allowed the Government of India to embark in costly frontier policy, and to spend millions on extravagant military administration, that there was a deficit in the Indian Budget. He denied that this agitation was purely and solely in the interests of the people of India. These duties were not in the interests of India, and certainly they were not in the interest of England. The interest of both these countries was in the most complete commercial freedom, and the exchange of their commodities freely, openly and without restraint. So long as the House of Commons continued, he would not say for interested motives, but under the claim of a forced patriotism, to insist on the imposition of duties inimical to that great principle, so long would he and his friends raise their voices against them, until this grievous injustice was removed.

Mr. G. Whiteley desired, as a cotton spinner and manufacturer himself, to press home upon the House the all-importance of this subject, for it was a matter the weight and gravity of which could not possibly be exaggerated for the people of Lancashire. He did not abate by one jot or tittle the views he enunciated when this question was last before the House; rather he affirmed them with even more vigour and earnestness than ever. He entirely agreed with the views of the hon. member for Burnley. There was no doubt whatever that in Lancashire this question of the imposition of import duties on cotton goods had a great effect in deciding the course of the elections in that county. It was, in fact, a bread-and-butter question for Lancashire. He should like cursorily to run over one or two of the arguments he advanced in the former debate. He contended that there was protection in the way these duties were levied at the present time. Up to 20's there was absolute protection for the Indian spinner and manufacturer. In many quarters it was supposed that we did not, in this country, ever spin or manufacture goods out of 20's or under; but that opinion was entirely fallacious. At the present time there were in Lancashire three millions of spindles, producing annually 250 million pounds weight of yarn of 20's and under, and this must be compared with a number of spindles in India, producing 274 millions pounds weight of yarn, or 10 per cent. over what we produced in this country. At the present time yarn was being shipped to India 20's and under, capable of manufacturing 25 millions of yards of cloths. It was impossible, therefore, to deny that for 20's and under the duties now imposed were absolutely protective. Over 20's there was partial protection, the duty being levied on the full value of any cloth imported into India, whereas in native goods it was only levied on 60 per cent. of the total value of the cloth. These were plain figures which could not be denied. A good deal of use had been made of the stores argument, that there was a 5 per cent. duty paid by the Indian manufacturer on stores imported. That was an argument in which there was absolutely nothing. Apart from coal and oil, both of which were produced in India, the stores necessary in the manufacture of cloth were in India very small indeed. In India they had cotton at their own doors, wages very much lower, no cost of freight as we have in bringing American cotton to this country and taking the cloth to India, and likewise no Factory Acts—so that if Indian cotton manufacturers could claim any rectification of the duty on the stores question, tenfold could Lancashire claim rectification in consequence of the heavy burdens under which their trade was carried on. This duty amounted to 5 per cent. on the turnover, and, as those acquainted with weaving concerns would know, this was sometimes three or four times the amount of the capital. The duty amounted therefore to an impost of 15 or 20 per cent. against the English manufacturer. A good deal has been made of the fact that a great part of the Indian productions were of yarns of 20's or under, while the English imports were of over 20. It was argued that it was impossible there could be competition between yarns counting under 20 and yarns over 20. But again he declared this to be a fallacious argument. He could understand that trade in boots could not compete with trade in hats, but he could not understand the argument that low-priced boots could not compete with high-priced boots. Neither could he understand the *rationale* of the contention that, because cloth of a coarser texture was woven in India, it did not compete with the sale of finer English imports. As well say that, because New Zealand mutton was coarser and cheaper than the home production, it did not compete with English meat. It did compete with the English produce, and the latter would suffer much more if it had to bear an impost of 5 per cent. There was fierce competition between England and India in cotton manufactures, and while the trade at home was practically stagnant and flagging, in India the cotton industry was developing and progressive. Since these duties were imposed the shares in Indian mills had sprung up to the amount of Rx.1,600,000, and he learnt from a director of two Indian companies that they were paying the one 12 and the other 22 per cent. on the capital. It was a monstrous injustice that a flagging waning industry at home should be taxed to make good a deficiency which appeared in the finances of a country where a thriving trade was carried on scot free. The state of affairs in Lancashire had not improved since this subject was last debated in the House. There was the same stoppage of machinery, the same number, if not more, of operatives vainly seeking employment, and the prospect was equally black, if not blacker than it was then. On this ground he, Unionist Member as he was, did not hesitate to record his opinion, and if this question came up on a vote of confidence, and the all-important issue depended on the vote of one member, he should vote against any Government, Unionist or Liberal, that had for its policy the maintenance of these duties. He believed that the maintenance of these duties struck at the root of the prosperity of the county in which he was engaged, and sitting as he did for a commercial constituency, and believing that to this constituency this trade matter was of primary importance, he would not hesitate to take the action he had described. He regretted that there was not a trade party in the House that would give precedence to trade above all other questions, defending them against the assaults of either party. Lancashire members, however, were not wholly unreasonable. They recognised that the noble lord had been in office only a few weeks, and that it was his bounden duty to hold the scales equally between contending interests. They did not expect the noble lord to perform miracles on behalf of Lancashire, and he had the right to claim time for consideration. They recognised that the task of abolishing these duties was infinitely greater than that of preventing their imposition in the first instance. The noble lord was in a very difficult position. He might issue his fiat and abolish the duties, but then he would disorder the finances of India, or he might allow them to remain as they were, a crying injustice to this country. There were two initial steps the noble lord might take. Initial steps only he called them, because Lancashire would never be contented until the total abolition of these duties was obtained. But two steps the noble lord might take to remove the sting from the present position of affairs. The first would be to treat India and Lancashire exactly alike. There was reason in the claim that Lancashire and India should be put on the same footing. This might be done by putting a duty of 5 per cent. on all yarns imported into or manufactured in India, and on all cloth imported into India, the latter to be taxed on the yarn and not the manufactured value. Such a duty would not disorganise the finances of India, but would bring grist into the Indian mill. The second course which had been suggested by some of his friends was that the Indian Government should take a step Lord Beaconsfield's Government took twenty years ago, when all imported goods manufactured of yarns under 30's were exempted from duty. Failing the adoption of the first expedient, which he preferred, the noble lord might adopt the second. He would not enter into the question of the loss of revenue to India which the abolition of the duties might involve, for that was dealt fully with when the subject was last before the House, when it was pointed out that there were taxes in England which were not raised in India. It was said that the difficulty was a monetary one, arising out of the depreciation of silver, which the marvellously increasing supply of gold would make only temporary in its duration, and it was also suggested that the difficulty might be got over by the Indian Government resorting to the expedient of borrowing. Lancashire, as a community, had a greater stake in the well-being and welfare of India than any other community in Great Britain, and they would be attempting a suicidal policy were they to advocate any policy that would seriously hurt India. They asked the Government to be impartial, and, in the laudable desire not to render injustice to India, to take very great care they did not render injustice to this country. He hoped the Government would soon find a *via media* in this matter, as he believed they would endeavour to do once they fully appreciated the facts which Lancashire members had laid before the House.

Mr. Frederick Cawley believed that the import duties had had a very good educational effect upon the people of this country, and especially of Lancashire. Lancashire people were beginning to see that the question of exchange was not the only, or even the greatest cause of the deficit in the Indian revenue. They were beginning to see that the Indian Empire was administered in an extravagant manner; and that this country did not bear her proper share of the civil and military charges. But, above and beyond all, it was, in his opinion and the opinion of Lancashire, this everlasting policy of the extension of Empire that had brought about the deficit in the Indian revenue. He admitted that this policy had to some extent been sanctioned by the country at the last General Election, for hon. members opposite were never tired of enlarging upon the merits of the extension of our Empire, and the trade that followed our flag. If, however, the country wished this heroic policy, the country as a whole should pay for it, and the burden should not be cast upon either the poor consumer of India or upon the depressed cotton industry of Lancashire. The hon. member for Hampshire (Mr. Jeffreys), speaking at the commencement of this Session on agricultural depression, talked of relieving the local burdens on agricultural land to the extent of three millions per annum. In Lancashire they wanted no subsidy and no charity; they merely wanted justice. They said that as neither the consumer in India nor the people engaged in the cotton trade in Lancashire were responsible for the ever-increasing expenditure, so neither the producer in Lancashire or the consumer in India should be called upon to make up the deficit in the Indian revenne.

Mr. A. WYLIE said, that when the Indian Tariff Act was passed, imposing duties upon goods imported into India, cotton goods were expressly excluded from the operation of the measure, because it was recognised that there had grown up in India a great and increasing cotton industry, which, if duties were imposed on cotton goods of home manufacture, would be protected against the competition of Lancashire. When recently the Indian Government proposed to include cotton goods within the operation of the Tariff Act, the right hon. member for Wolverhampton, then Secretary for India, laid down the principle, which has been repeatedly affirmed by this House, that. in connection with Indian Import Duties there must be no protection. In his Dispatch of 13th of December to the Indian Government he said:—"It will be understood that Her Majesty's Government are precluded by the pledges quoted from sanctioning the imposition of Import Duties on cotton goods unless under such conditions as will ensure beyond question that the duties thus imposed will have no protective effect." Acting in accordance with those instructions the Government of India devised a scheme of excise duties for the purpose of eliminating the element of protection from the import duties, and the Home Government, misguided by the information which they received, believed that the element of protection had been eliminated and sanctioned the imposition of the cotton duties. He proposed to take first dyed yarns and dyed and printed cloth, as showing in the most direct and aggravated form how serious an amount of protection was still caused by the Indian Import Duties. One special item of information supplied to the Government at home was that there was no competition between India and Lancashire in coarse yarns, viz., 20's and under, because the Lancashire yarns had been driven out of the market by the native manufactures. The Secretary for India, on February 21st, stated clearly that the Lancashire trade in coarse yarns had decreased until it had nearly reached vanishing point. But six days afterwards a deputation representing the dyers of the west of Scotland waited upon the right hon. member and convinced him that instead of there being no competition in coarse yarns between Lancashire and India, the Scotch dyers were importing such goods into British Burma to a large extent. The result of these representations was that an Order in Council was passed reducing the duty on coarse dyed yarns going into British Burma from 5 per cent. to $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. He would ask the Secretary of State for India why even this $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty, was allowed to remain on those coarse yarns. A clear case of protection having been proved, the duty ought to have been removed altogether. Why, again, was not a rebate granted to the Scotch dyers, who had had to pay the 5 per cent. duty, as is done every other day to the Indian manufacturers in the case of yarns exported to China and elsewhere? He found that a general impression existed that the injustice to the dyers was removed almost completely with the exception of this $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., but he wished to point out that it was only on a very small part of their production that the injustice was removed. A very large percentage no less than nine-tenths of their production, was still affected by a 5 per cent. duty, which acted almost entirely as protection to the Indian competitors. He would give two instances to prove this. The other portion of their trade with Burma consisted principally of 24's. The Bombay dyers —quite as much an alien race to the Burmese as the British— could send dyed 24's to Burma, paying 5 per cent. on only 7 annas per pound, while the British dyer paid on 15 annas, being over 100 per cent. more. Take the other case. The Bombay dyer imported a bale of 400 lbs. grey 40's from Lancashire, for which he paid duty on a value of only about £11. When the same yarn was dyed here and sent to Bombay, it paid duty on about double that amount; and when it was woven into cloth on this side, dyed and printed, the duty was trebled, quadrupled, and in some cases even quintupled (as compared with their Indian competitors), according to the labour bestowed upon it. This duty was principally on British labour. These two instances showed, in a very clear and accentuated form, the truth of some of the leading objections put forward by the Lancashire manufacturers in their admirable memorial to the Secretary for India, viz.:—"(1.) That the excise duty secures an immunity from competition in the Indian markets by England in counts 20's and below." He had already proved that there was still a considerable trade. With American cotton at 3d. per pound, it would be a large trade if left duty free. "(2.) That the import duty imposed on goods exported from this country, made from 20's and below, without any countervailing excise duty being imposed on goods made from similar counts in India, is absolutely protective in its character." Indian manufacturers were taxed only on spinning costs; British on both spinning and weaving. "(3.) That the 5 per cent. import duty charged on the *ad valorem* value of our manufactured goods is not completely countervailed by the 5 per cent. excise duty charged on the yarn value of goods made in India from counts above 20's, and that, so far as any portion of the value of these goods is not chargeable with excise duty, the import duty becomes protective to that extent." That this was the case he thought he had completely proved in dealing with dyed and printed yarns and cloths. "(4.) That the exemption from excise duty of yarns 20's and below will encourage the manufacture of duty-free cloths, as such exemption enables the Indian manufacturer to avoid the excise duty altogether, by substituting in the manufacture of cloth of non-excisable yarns for excisable yarns." There could be no stronger confirmation of this objection than the fact that, when yarns and goods of no higher numbers than 30's were admitted into India duty free, the exports of yarn above 32's fell from $26\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to $18\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of our total exports in five years ending 1883, and when the duty was repealed they advanced again to 27 per cent. in the five years ending 1893. "(5.) That it is impossible to place a dividing line between the manufacturers of Lancashire and India, whereby a duty levied on one, unless completely countervailed, will not afford a protective incidence to one to the consequent injury of the other." This would be clearly seen from the previous arguments. "(6.) That the imposition of these duties has inflicted serious injury to our trade, and will continue to do so unless completely countervailed." He thought that strong evidence of the protective character of these Indian cotton duties was to be found, in the first place, in the falling off in British manufactures since the duties were imposed. In the five months which had elapsed since the duties were imposed, there had been a falling off in British manufactures of something like 267,000,000 yards, or 25 per cent. But even a stronger illustration was to be found in the enormous increase in the value of Indian mill stocks. The Indian mill stocks had increased by Rx.1,600,000, which was Rx.250,000 more than the whole of the cotton duties would provide. He thought it had been proved that there was a very strong protective element in these duties, and therefore it was right that the attention of Her Majesty's Government and of the Government of India should be called to the question. They had now in this country a Government which sympathised with the manufacturers, and he hoped that they would be impressed by the strong case that had been made out in their behalf. They were glad to know that the Secretary for India shared the feelings of his Chief in this matter. He thought it was much more necessary to direct the attention of the Indian Government to the real state of the case, as he believed a great deal of their information had been derived from *ex parte* statements. India might say she had as much right to protect her manufactures by import duties as any of our colonies. He hoped the day was not far distant when, by a wise federal system, the trade between the mother country and her colonies would be as free as the winds of heaven. But India was in a different position. India had been called into existence by an enormous expenditure of British blood and treasure. India could not exist for a day if British influonce were withdrawn. Lord Roberts once asked a distinguished native what he thought would be the effect of the withdrawal, of the British army from India, and the reply was that it would have the same effect as the opening of the doors of a menagerie—there would be indiscriminate carnage. India must learn that, under these circumstances, she would not be allowed to close her doors against the manufactures of this country. India might say that her financial position was such that it was imperatively necessary that those duties should be imposed, but Lord Kimberley and his successor did not admit that the finances of India were in an unsatisfactory state; and it is doubted whether any European State could show that its finances were in a more satisfactory state than those of India. India might say that she had no other source from which to raise her revenue. The Hon. W. R. Macdonell, on 27th February last, said:—"There is no other civilised country in the world in which the public burdens are so light as in India." And in this most lightly-burdened of all countries the wealthy native classes are pre-eminently the most lightly taxed of all. India may say that after all a 5 per cent. duty is but a light tax on a wealthy country like this; but it would enable the Indian manufacturer to work at a profit of 2½ per cent., whilst his British competitor is working at a loss of 2½ per cent. Finally, India might say that the imposition of these duties was sanctioned by a large majority of the House of Commons. Several causes contributed to that decision, apart from the merits of the question. But the principal reason why there was such a large majority was, because the Indian Secretary had affirmed that the element of protection had been entirely eliminated from these duties. But he had shown that a large amount of direct protection still existed, and also an enormous amount of indirect protection. It was quite evident that the information which overlooked such an important fact as an existing competition of this country with India in coarse yarns, to the extent of two million pounds, entirely had overlooked the more abstruse questions of indirect protection of which the people of Lancashire so justly complained. He thought if the question had come before even the late House of Commons clearly and distinctly on its merits, there would not have been a majority in favour of the Indian Import Duties. But the present House of Commons was of a very different description; the vast majority of the members from Lancashire and the districts surrounding had been returned pledged to oppose the cotton duties. It was true that a great many of these had the disadvantage of being new members, a disadvantage of which some hon. friends on the opposite benches had not failed frequently to remind them. But he might hint to these gentlemen that they had now quite sufficiently impressed them with the enormous superiority which attached to themselves from the fact of their being old members. But even the new members from Lancashire possessed a practical knowledge of this difficult question of the Indian import duties, which was not exceeded by that of the oldest members of the House, and they would be prepared to give a steady and most influential vote in favour of free trade. Not only in Lancashire, but in the West of Scotland also, there had been a change in the representation which had been to a certain extent influenced by this question. He thought he might say that he represented a very large section of the commercial community of Glasgow, and, in conjunction with one of the largest East Indian merchants, Mr. Donald Graham, who had had great experience in India, he had carried a motion unanimously in the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce for the entire repeal of all the import duties. He believed that a measure for their entire repeal would be supported in the House, not only by the members from Lancashire and the surrounding districts, but by those who were in favour of free trade, and those who took an interest in the condition of the unemployed, as well as by the public opinion in the country. There had been great education of public opinion since the time of the last debate on the subject, principally at the time of the general election, and the people of the country now saw that Lancashire, instead of being actuated by a spirit of greed, wished only to have fair play. It was now recognised that, owing to the imposition of these duties, that part of the country had been passing through the gravest crisis in the history of her trade since the great cotton famine, and that the masters and men had borne this infliction with that great heroism which had characterised them at the time of their still greater distress. The Indian Government should take early steps, in conjunction with the Home Government, to abolish these duties. If they were not abolished, as he hoped they would be, during the recess, he believed that, when Parliament met again, motions would be brought forward for their abolition, and that both sides of the House would combine in seeing that all these duties were swept away.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: I think it will be agreeable to the majority of the House that I should reply to the points which have been thus far raised in the discussion. An abstract discussion such as this should not be unduly pressed. Most of the preceding speakers have alluded to a speech I made in February last on the question of the imposition of these cotton duties. I did not make that speech with a view to the elections or to the interests of any section of the community. I spoke of the agitation and disturbance which had been caused by the cotton duties which were in existence some years ago. I believe that I am the only person in the House who has an official experience of what those duties meant. When I spoke in February, I endeavoured to do so from a high national, Imperial standpoint. The views which I then expressed I still hold. I had learnt them when I was at the India Office in 1874, from men like the present Prime Minister, then Secretary of State for India, from Sir Henry Maine, from Sir Louis Mallet, and from others, and, knowing what they thought, I spoke with reluctance and with some trepidation on this question. I think that of all questions which the House of Commons has had to deal with in my experience none requires more delicate handling and none contains more germs of danger. The moment these cotton duties are imposed you array at once the great industries of this country one against another. You have in Lancashire the largest population of any county in the United Kingdom, and they are practically united on this one point, that they consider the cotton duties imposed in India as unjust in principle and injurious to their interests, and, unfortunately, that great cotton industry is not in a flourishing condition. Both masters and mill hands believe that their difficulty and misfortune are in some way connected with these cotton duties. On the other hand, you have in India a most powerful and increasing industry, united together by sentiment and race, who are strongly in favour of these duties. They have control of the English and native Press; and thus, by the very fact of imposing these duties, you have that which every politician would try to avoid: you bring two distant points of the Empire into direct collision one with the other. As these rival interests grow and develop, so does the bitterness and intensity of the controversy between them increase. That is a serious position, and when I spoke in February I spoke entirely from that point of view, and from that point of view alone. I felt at the time that nothing but extreme financial exigency could justify the re-imposition of those cotton duties. But my predecessor persuaded the House that such financial exigencies did exist, and, whatever they were, the military operations since sanctioned have widened the margin between Income and Expenditure for this year. To-morrow I think I shall be able to show my hon. friends that there are fallacies in their arguments so far as the control over expenditure was exercised by the Indian Government and recourse to new taxation are concerned. The Indian Government are not extravagant; on the contrary, no other country in the world is so economically managed. But it is easy to understand that, no matter how ably and how well the Indian Government may perform their work, they have the greatest difficulty in making both ends meet. Year by year the loss on transmitting funds to meet their gold obligations has so increased that this year it shows no less than 27 per cent. of their total net available income. The hon. member for Burnley, by his motion, has invited the Indian Government to pledge itself to the early repeal of the import duties upon goods, but, speaking as Secretary for India, I am bound to see fair play between the contending parties, and to see that justice is done, having regard to the present conditions of Indian finance. Under present conditions it would be impossible in any way to pledge myself, but, even if it were within the bounds of possibility, I doubt whether it would be a proper course to pursue. If I were now to pledge myself to adopt the course suggested by the motion it would naturally render every subsequent act of mine open to suspicion in India: I should be making promises which I might not afterwards be able to perform. (Hear, hear.) The old duties on cotton were imposed originally subject to no conditions as to protection: but after they had been in operation some time they were objected to on the ground that they were protective, and resolutions were passed by successive Parliaments protesting against the policy of protective duties in India, and finally they were removed. The right hon. gentleman, when the duties were re-imposed last year, undertook, if any duties were imposed which were protective, to submit them to the House of Commons before he assented to them. He was attacked, and it was alleged that he had not complied with his promise. But I think his defence was adequate and straightforward—that the duties he sanctioned were found to be not protective, and that he would prevent them from being protective in their effect. The pledge given by the right hon. gentleman in connection with the duties was agreed to by the Indian Government, and since those duties have been in operation a deputation waited on my predecessor which pointed out that in Burma certain yarns from Scotland, undoubtedly competed with local yarns protected by the duty. The right hon. gentleman wrote to the Indian Government and they at once repealed the duties and reduced them from 5 to ½ per cent. The only reason that the ½ per cent. remains is that by Executive action the Indian Government cannot repeal duties imposed by legislation. Since then—on May 27th last—the right hon. gentleman received a deputation of Lancashire and Scotch mill-owners, who put some important points before him. At the close of his interview with the deputation, he said:—"Now the point is, is that Excise Duty countervailing in the true sense of the word, or is it not? They say it is not only countervailing, but it is so excessively countervailing that you have inflicted —'you' being as somebody called me, 'the Secretary of State for Lancashire,' not for India—'you have inflicted a great injury upon us.' You gentlemen come here to-day and you say, 'On the contrary, we dissent from that *in toto;* you have imposed an Excise Duty which is not a countervailing Excise Duty, but omit a great many points and which exposes us to an unfair competition.' Now, then, what I ask you gentlemen is to send me an argument based upon that, and upon nothing else. Let us have no other issues; that is the issue at stake. I promise you that that shall be not only considered here, but shall be sent to India, and we shall then know what they have got to say to it." That was the position of affairs. A change of Government took place. The memorial which the right hon. gentleman asked them to send to him was sent to me, and it has been sent to the Indian Government. Now, to the position hitherto maintained by those responsible for the Government of India, that the duties are not to be protective, I adhere. It seems to me from the time the re-imposition of the duties was contemplated there has been a common understanding to which, with the exception of a member here and a member there, the whole House are more or less a party, on that side (the Opposition side) as well as this. I will put myself into communication with the Indian Government, and I will do all in my power to eliminate anything savouring of protection from the duties. In the debate that has taken place hon. members have spoken with the greatest moderation. Whether you agreed with Lancashire, or with Indian millowners, hon. members had all spoken with the moderation becoming the treatment of a grave and serious question. Nothing more illustrates the difficulty of the situation than the fact stated by the right hon. gentleman last year, that he had done his best to be just to both sides and he had been equally abused by both sides. It is clear what my attitude is. If trade does revive, and if the Indian revenues permit these duties to be dispensed with, we shall be able once more to leave the English millowners and the Indian millowners in a natural and healthy condition of unbiassed competition in regard to the supply of cotton goods to the people of India.

Mr. R. **ASCROFT**, in addressing the House for the first time, said, there were in Lancashire large mills well equipped with machinery actually closed, and others in which looms were standing idle. For a long time capital had been gradually dwindling away, and at last it had come to be felt that this question of the Indian Import Duties, small as it might appear to be, might be the means of ruining one of the greatest industries in the country. He had listened with satisfaction to what had fallen from the Secretary of State for India, and Lancashire members would feel that the raising of the question would encourage operatives and employers to struggle on till these duties could be dealt with. He congratulated the Secretary for India on the happier position in which he had placed the question of the duties. He did not know whether the noble Lord had seen a speech recently delivered by the President of the Bombay Millowners' Association, one of the bodies whose previous arguments were placed before the late Secretary for India when he decided the course to be taken. The president of that association said: "I think it would be sound policy for the Government of India to remove the slightest shred of complaint by notifying that all 20's yarn and under, and cloth made from 20's yarn and under, imported from Great Britain, should be duty free. A simple notification, as has been done with Glasgow dyed yarn imported into Rangoon, would be sufficient. If there is no import of goods made from 20's yarn, then there can be no loss of revenue. If, on the other hand, there is a limited quantity of such goods imported, it is only just, however small the quantity, that they should come in duty free. My own impression is that no goods made of 20's yarn and under are imported, and certainly no 20's yarn. As your chairman, I would like it to go forth that while we, in common with other citizens, supported the reimposition of the import duties for purposes of revenue, we are as much opposed to protection in any form as the most ardent free trader in England." After such an expression of opinion, it could no longer be said that Lancashire was pursuing a selfish policy. It was not a Lancashire policy, but it was one by which both England and India would be benefited, and a part of the policy promised by the present Government, and which he now asked should be carried out, as it affected the commercial industries of the country. The policy on which the Government came into office was a policy of advancing the national prosperity of the country, of opening new markets, of increasing the field of employment. Lancashire, therefore, made no selfish appeal in her own interest. What she asked for was that the Government should carry out the policy on which they came into office; and it would be a national calamity for the country if one of its chief industries, like the cotton industry of Lancashire, were destroyed.

Mr. H. J. **WHITELEY**, in a maiden speech, said he was afraid the statement of the noble lord the Secretary for India would be read with some disappointment in Lancashire. No member of the House was suffering as he was suffering in his trade relations owing to those import duties, but he did not plead for himself; he pleaded on behalf of the 400 work-people in his employment, who, since the imposition of those duties, had not had two consecutive weeks' full work, with the result that they had to endure much suffering and want, and this was a case illustrative of many other firms in Lancashire. It was said that it was not the manufacturer in Lancashire, but the consumer in India, who would pay this duty. He declared without fear of contradiction that it was the Lancashire manufacturers who would pay the duty, and who would have to continue to pay it so long as the native manufacturers enjoyed their present favoured position as compared with their competitors in England. Lancashire did not desire to be selfish in this matter. If it were proved that owing to the financial difficulties in India this course was inevitable, they would acquiesce; but they asked that they should be put on an equality with India, and that if they were to make this sacrifice they should be assured that it was not for the benefit of manufacturers in India, but for our mighty Empire as a whole. (Cheers.)

The motion for going into Committee was then agreed to.

The motion respecting the finances was then put from the Chair as follows:—"That it appears, by the Accounts laid before this House, that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1894, was Rx. 90,565,214; that the total Expenditure in India and in England charged against the Revenue was Rx. 92,112,212; and there was an Excess of Expenditure over Revenue of Rx. 1,546,988, and that the capital outlay on Railways and Irrigation Works was Rx. 3,621,252."

On this motion being put, Mr. A. J. **BALFOUR** said that as it was too late for his noble friend the Secretary for India to make his financial statement, he moved to report progress. The statement would be made by his noble friend at twelve o'clock to-morrow.

The motion to report progress was agreed to, and the House resumed.

September 4th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

LORD G. HAMILTON'S SPEECH.

The House went into Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts, and the formal resolution was submitted as follows:—"That it appears, by the accounts laid before this House, that the total revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1894, was Rx.90,565,214; that the total expenditure in India and in England charged against the revenue was Rx.92,112,212; that there was an excess of expenditure over revenue of Rx.1,546,998; and that the capital outlay on railways and irrigation works was Rx.3,621,252."

Lord George Hamilton said: Those conversant with Indian finance are aware that the annual statement which the India Office has to make refers to three financial years, and not two. The revenue and expenditure accounts now under the consideration of the Committee relate to the years 1893-4, 1894-5, and 1895-6. The figures of the first year are those of the closed account, those of the second year are in the closing stage, and those of the third year are estimates alone. I propose to take throughout the net revenue and expenditure, and to revert to the old form as contained in the accounts of the Indian Government for some time past. My right hon. friend and predecessor, amongst other great qualities, is a high expert in these questions of accounts. While he was at the the Treasury he introduced great improvements in the annual returns presented to Parliament. While my right hon. friend was at the India Office he endeavoured to classify the revenue and expenditure of India on the same principles. But one or two small alterations have to be made in the accounts of the Indian Government this year, and until these are complete I do not propose to deal with the matter. But I hope we shall settle all these small matters of detail before the close of the financial year. For the present I propose to take the statement of net revenue and expenditure as contained in the accounts before the Committee, which show deductions for cost of collection in respect of all the principal heads of revenue; while on the expenditure side departmental receipts are deducted from gross expenditure. In 1893-4 we find a net revenue of Rx.50,328,000, and a net expenditure of Rx.51,875,000, showing a deficit of Rx.1,547,000. This is better by Rx.245,800 than the deficit as estimated last year of Rx.1,792,800. The revenue is better by Rx.74,900, and the expenditure is less by Rx.170,900. I now come to the revised estimate for the year 1894-5; and the finance of the year is worthy of close attention. The preparations of the estimates of expenditure and revenue took place in a period of great financial depression. The exchange in the preceding year had been taken in the revised estimate at 14·6d. per rupee. The amount realised was 14·5466d. per rupee. But there were indications that the exchange value of the rupee was likely to fall; therefore the Indian Government were compelled to estimate their transactions for the ensuing year at a lower rate than that at which they had taken it in the preceding year. Every variation of one-tenth of a penny in the exchange value of the rupee makes a difference of about 22 lakhs to the Indian revenue or expenditure, as the case may be. Therefore the Indian Government, having to provide a considerable additional sum to meet the further fall in the exchange, were compelled to look around to find how they could balance revenue and expenditure. They had in their judgment almost exhausted the resources of taxation, and so they proposed certain reductions of expenditure. They reduced the Imperial expenditure on civil works by Rx.130,000, and on military works by Rx.150,000. They further obtained assistance from the Provincial Governments to the extent of Rx.405,000 and suspended the operation of the Famine Insurance Fund to the extent of Rx.1,076,200, and they imposed import duties on most articles of trade, estimated to produce Rx.1,140,000 net. In this way they were able to reduce their deficit to Rx.301,900. The revenue for 1894-5 was taken at Rx.50,943,500; and the expenditure at Rx. 51,245,400. But the exchange fell heavily in the earlier months of the financial year, so that the exchange value of the rupee was depreciated from 14d. to $12\frac{1}{32}$d. There is, therefore, every probability that the surplus for the year will amount to Rx.1,230,000. (Cheers.) I think this result is very satisfactory. Now, the bills sold last year amounted to Rx.30,970,000 and it realised £16,905,102. I am sorry to say that, although this is by far the largest amount of bills which have ever been sold, owing to the great fall in the value of the rupee it has not realised the largest amount in gold, for in 1881-2 Rx.22,211,000 realised £18,412,429. I think there are four distinctive features in connection with the finance of 1894-5, the year with which I am dealing. The deficit has been converted into a considerable surplus under the most depressed conditions yet known in connection with exchange; there has been the largest sale of bills upon India; the credit for borrowing purposes is raised to a higher point than has ever before been attained; and the last, but I am afraid not the least, feature is the imposition of import duties upon cotton goods. I now come to the Budget Estimate for 1895-6. The Indian Government were compelled to look about for some additions to their revenue, the reductions of expenditure being exhausted. They were compelled to have recourse to the only tax available, and the right hon. gentleman, after full consideration, gave his assent to cotton goods being included in the Customs duties, and the inclusion of cotton goods in such duties was estimated to yield Rx. 354,100. The Excise was estimated to yield Rx. 12,500, so that the addition to the revenue, according to the estimate, after allowing for refunds, was Rx. 359,100. But the fall in the value of the rupee had added an expenditure far exceeding that amount, so that, unless there was an improvement in the revenue, there was the prospect of having to face a deficit far in excess of that which was originally estimated. I am glad, however, to be able to give a better account of the revenue than was then anticipated. The revised figures show an increase in the revenue of Rx. 2,794,800. The net expenditure is only increased by Rx. 1,502,400. The revised figures, therefore, are Rx. 1,292,400 better than the estimate of last year, and this improvement has enabled the Indian Government to turn their estimated deficit of Rx. 301,900 into a surplus of Rx. 990,500. (Hear, hear.) I pointed out that the expenditure is increased by Rx. 1,502,400. The charge for exchange on net sterling expenditure, in addition to that originally estimated by the Government for this year, has amounted to Rx. 1,806,700, so that, apart from that, there would have been a reduction of net Imperial expenditure of over Rx. 300,000. I wish the Committee to bear this fact prominently in mind, that right throughout the statement I have to make the one difficulty with which the Indian Government have to contend is the fall in exchange; it has a blighting and withering influence in every direction. (Hear, hear.) The main source of the improvement of which I have spoken will be found in the Railway Revenue Account, which, though on the whole showing an additional charge on Imperial account of Rx. 313,300, was, apart from exchange, better by Rx. 395,500. There was a net reduction on the Army expenditure of Rx. 259,400, and under other heads of expenditure of Rx. 47,400. In the middle of the financial year a most successful conversion of the debt was made, for which I beg to offer my congratulations to my predecessor. The Four per cent. rupee Loan was converted into a debt bearing interest at 3½ per cent., but there was a certain necessary expenditure attending this conversion which increased the estimated expenditure of the year by Rx. 301,000. This increase, however, will bring a more than corresponding gain in subsequent years in the diminution of the interest which hereafter will have to be paid. Turning to the revenue side, part of the large increase is due to opium. The year 1894-5 was the sixth consecutive bad year, and the worst of the six. The price consequently rose, and it ultimately attained the figure in December of Rs. 1,480, in January Rs. 1,523, and in February Rs. 1,540, which is the highest price known since 1871. This rise in the price of opium enabled the Indian Government to raise the duty on the Malwa opium. There was also a reduction in the expenditure, so that the net revenue was better, so far as opium was concerned, by Rx. 1,537,300. The next head of revenue which shows a marked improvement is the Customs. The new Customs Bill was imposed at the close of 1893-4. In the Budget for 1894-5, credit was taken for an addition through the Customs duties of Rx. 1,270,000, including Rx. 100,000 on imports of silver. In the revised estimate the new duties are taken at Rx. 1,733,000, including Rx. 355,000 from silver, a gain over the Budget of Rx. 463,000. The improvement on articles paying the old rates of duty was Rx. 100,600, and the inclusion in the Customs duties of cotton goods brought in during the last three months of the year a further increase of Rx.354,000. Rx.12,500 was obtained from the Excise on yarns, and the charges for collection were less than had been estimated by Rx.22,000. The final result is an improvement, so far as the net Customs revenue is concerned, of Rx.952,100. In addition to these two great sources of improvement—opium and Customs—the net revenue was enhanced under Excise by Rx.203,600, and under stamps, assessed taxes, forest, and other heads, by Rx.216,100. On the other hand, there was a falling off in the land revenue, owing to the postponement of collection, especially in the North-West Provinces, of Rx.114,300. I am glad, however, to say, that I have received further accounts which indicate what the final results of the year will be, and these accounts show a still further improvement. The net revenue is expected to be Rx.7,000 better than the revised estimate, and the net expenditure is reduced by Rx.232,500. 1895-6, taking as my basis the deficit in the Budget for 1894-5 of Rx.301,900. The additional charge for exchange was estimated at Rx.2,503,700. There was certain exceptional relief obtained, as I have explained, in 1894-5 by the contributions of the Provincial Governments and by cutting down the expenditure on civil and military works, which it was not proposed to renew; it amounted to Rx.685,000. There was an additional charge in connection with the cultivation of opium amounting to Rx.460,000, and there was a certain preliminary expenditure connected with the Chitral expedition which amounted to Rx.150,000. The Indian Government also decided to increase the pay of the Sepoy to Rs.9 a month, adding for 1895-6 Rx.180,000. That will give great satisfaction to a body of men who have, on every occasion on which they have been asked to take part in any military expedition, greatly distinguished themselves. (Hear, hear). Therefore, the excess of expenditure for which the Indian Government had to provide is Rx.4,280,600. Against this they reckoned on the following improvements:—Saving of interest by conversion of debt, Rx.422,000, and by discharge of debt not at present replaced, Rx.102,800; increase from General Customs duties, Rx.427,900; cotton import and excise duties, Rx.1,455,000, making a total improvement from Customs of Rx.1,882,900. There was an estimated improvement in General Revenues of Rx.1,919,100, making a grand total of Rx.4,326,800, which gives the small surplus of Rx.46,200. Since then we have had information as to the estimated expenditure in connection with the Chitral expedition and the occupation of Chitral, and other charges have cropped up in the interval. The increase of expenditure on the Chitral expedition is estimated at Rx.2,210,000; Chitral occupation, Rx.200,000; and other charges connected with other departments, Rx.160,000, making a total estimated increase of expenditure of Rx.2,570,000. On the other hand, there is a saving on opium payments of Rx.800.000, making, therefore, a net increase of expenditure of Rx.1.770,000. There is an increase of revenue of Rx.510,000, showing a net deterioration of Rx.1,260,000. According to these figures, including the previous estimated surplus, the deficit will be Rx.1,213,800. I am glad to say that the exchange has been a less heavy drain upon the Indian Exchequer than was anticipated, and there are various signs of improvement in certain portions of the Indian Revenue. I am, therefore, sanguine that before the year closes we shall arrive at a much closer approximation between income and expenditure than these figures indicate. Taking a view of the last three years, we have these facts brought before us. We started in the first year with a considerable deficit, in the second year we converted that deficit into a surplus, and in the third year, though we have a deficit, it is entirely due to unexpected very large military operations; while there can be very little doubt that a considerable part of the military operations will be paid for out of the revenue of the year. (Hear, hear.) I think the position is distinctly better than it was three years ago, but it is still not free from anxiety, Indian finance requiring close vigilance and supervision. I have dealt with the figures of the last three years. The embarrassments and difficulties with which the Government have had to contend during the last three years have naturally been the subject of much criticism, and they have had many accusations brought against them. There is an impression that the financial embarrassments of the Indian Government are largely due to there being no effective supervision over their expenditure, and that these embarrassments were only natural, inasmuch as the control of Indian expenditure was entirely vested in the official element in the Government. It was assumed that if you could associate with the officials an elective or representative element, the effect of that amalgamation would be to increase the stringency of financial supervision and produce economy where extravagance now reigns. I want to test, by the latest authentic returns, the accuracy of this allegation. Is it true or is it not that the Indian Government are extravagant and do not sufficiently supervise the expenditure under their charge, and is it likely, taking experience afforded by the circumstances of the expenditure of other countries, that you would improve and strengthen the financial control over the expenditure of India by associating an elective or representative element with the Indian Government? I propose, for the purpose of answering these two questions, to take the returns of the last decade and to look first at the return which relates to the Imperial expenditure of Great Britain. Here the elective and representative element have greater control over expenditure than probably in any other country in the world, and if these elements can produce economy and a reduction of expenditure anywhere you would imagine it was in this House. The Army and Navy expenditure of Great Britain in 1884-5 was £30,561,000, and in 1894-5 £35,143,563. The expenditure on Civil Service and education 10 years ago was £11,000,000; it has now risen to £15,810,000, and, therefore, under these two heads alone, the expenditure, which is entirely under the control of this House, has been increased in the last decade by £9,390,000. I contrast this with the expenditure of the Indian Government. The Indian Government are in a position of much greater difficulty than the Government here. During that period they have had an increase of territory. Burma has been annexed, and various other small portions adjacent to the frontier of other parts of the Empire. The increase of population during that period has been no less than 33,000,000, and of this 23,000,000 is contained in territory directly administered by the Indian Government; therefore, one would assume that, having so very large an increase of area to administer, and, having thus had, as a matter of policy, to meet the necessity of adding largely to the army, the increase of expenditure during this decade would naturally be higher in comparison than that of the Imperial Government. The net expenditure for 1884-5 of the Indian Government was Rx.41,907,813, and in 1894-5 Rx.52,747,800, showing an increase of Rx.10,839,987. Now part of the expenditure is uuder the control of the Indian Government, but there are certain charges which are not. That which is not under their control is the increased expenditure caused by exchange. The increased charge for exchange during the decade was Rx.11,156,304, which is greater than the absolute increase of the whole net expenditure by Rx.316.317. In other words, the Indian Government—although they have had to administer a much larger territory during that period, although 20,000 additional Native soldiers have had to be added to the Native army, and 10,000 Europeans to the British Army—have been able adequately to carry on all these additional duties at a less cost than 10 years ago. (Cheers.) I say that is a very remarkable performance. If any political party in this country were able to discharge their financial duties as adequately the feat would be advertised from one end of the country to the other, and if there was an election it would be the standpoint from which the political party associated with such financial feats would have appealed to the country. And surely, Sir, if performances such as this in our own country would be entitled to praise, ought we to deny our countrymen at the other end of the world a similar meed of praise when they have accomplished such results. (Cheers.) I think I have effectually disproved the allegation that the embarrassments of the Indian Government are due to inefficient control over their expenditure. (Hear, hear.) I now turn to the other side of the account, namely, the revenue account. The increase of revenue in the period with which I am dealing is Rx.12,216,933. Is that due to the heavy, crushing taxation which has been imposed on India? Excluding the customs, the bulk of which is certainly not paid by the native population, there has only been imposed in that period additional taxation to the amount of Rx.2,940,000. In 1882 a large remission of taxation took place. That year is anterior to the decade I have chosen; but if you take the amount of the taxation remitted in 1882 and balance that against all the taxation which has been imposed since, you will find that the two amounts nearly balance one another; and, in fact, the only additional taxation from 1882 which has been imposed upon India is that in connection with the customs duty of last year. I have looked through the proceeds of the various taxes which have been imposed, and I am bound to say there is only one tax which does seem to press more heavily on the Indian people. That is the salt tax, which was raised in 1888. The consumption of salt seems to be an unfailing gauge as to the condition of the rayats throughout the country. The increase in the consumption of salt steadily increased up to 1892-3, and then there was a falling-off of 4 per cent. In 1894-5 there was a recovery of 2 per cent., and, so far as statistics are available at the present month, there are symptoms that that recovery is continuous. At the same time I shall watch the salt tax, which certainly seems to have reached the maximum limit, with the view, if possible, of taking an early opportunity of reducing it. Sir James Westland, the present Finance Minister, expressed his opinion before the Select Committee of 1884, that the normal improvement of the financial position of India might be estimated at about 41 lakhs annually. Taking the period with which I have dealt, I think we may fairly say that a large portion of that increase is due to the normal growth of the revenue, and not to increased taxation. The further question has been asked—Does India pay her way? I propose to answer that by again investigating the figures supplied to us by the decade to which I have already alluded. Taking that decade, I find that there are six years of surplus and four years of deficit. The net result of the ten years is a surplus of Rx. 1,000,000. But against that I am bound to say there is a circumstance which must be taken into account. During that time there has been a certain amount of debt raised in this country, and whenever a debt is raised for the purpose of meeting the annual obligations through inability to sell bills, the money so raised does benefit the year of the expenditure, and in a manner which cannot be brought to account, because, by diminishing the number of rupees that would otherwise be sold, it advances the price of those that are sold. The amount of the debt which was incurred in this period through the failure of the sale of bills amounts to £9,386,000, and I expect if we trace the exact effect of that sum in India we should find it probably rather more than counterbalanced the surplus of Rx. 1,000,000 to which I have alluded. Anyhow, during this period of exceptional embarrassment India has practically paid her way. (Cheers.) She has done more. The right hon. gentleman my predecessor in office, on more than one occasion called attention to the fact that probably no civilised country in the world contains so satisfactory a balance-sheet of liabilities and assets. If we take the assets and liabilities, we find that in India, including railways, irrigation works, loans to municipalities, and existing cash balances, India has assets amounting to Rx. 149,542,000. Against that she has only debts and obligations amounting to Rx. 122,951,000, showing an excess of assets over liabilities of Rx. 26,591,000. On the other hand, in England she has a considerable sterling debt. Her liabilities here are £116,006,000 of debt. Against that she has purchased railways which cost £59,236,000, there are advances to railway companies £5,409,000, and a cash balance of £2,446,000, showing an excess of liabilities over assets in this country of £48,915,000. When we think of the size of the continent that the Indian Government administer, I think that is a most satisfactory balance-sheet. (Cheers.) I have dealt with the bright side of Indian finance, and now take the dark side. I come to the question of exchange. I do not know if is known to the general public that for more than 20 years—that is, from 1850 to 1870—the average exchangeable value of the rupee was 2s., and that in 1873-4 the rupee began to fall in value, owing to the breaking down of the Latin Union and the demonetisation of silver by the German Government. Now two decades have elapsed since then. At the commencement of 1876-7 the exchange value of the rupee was 1s. 9½d.; at the close of the decade it was 1s. 7¼d., a considerable decline; but at the commencement of the next decade we commenced with silver at 1s. 6¼d., and we ended with silver at 1s. 1¼d. The Committee will, therefore, see that the fall in the price of silver has increased during the last decade in a greater proportion than in the previous decade. I have noticed in certain journals, and among certain individuals, a tendency to maintain that this very heavy fall in silver is beneficial to India. I see it stated in a very able paper, the *Statist*, that on the whole this fall was beneficial even to the Government of India. They sum up the position thus:—"The Government has not been injured, in spite of all the talk about loss by exchange; for if the burden of the foreign obligations of the Government has been increased, the ability of the taxpayers to bear the burden has been correspondingly increased also." That is a broad assertion. I do not think anybody can make that assertion until he knows what the cost to the taxpayer has been. Now, has any hon. gentleman, even the most optimistic, realised what the strain on the Indian revenue is by the constant fall in the price of silver and in the exchange value of the rupee? In 1884-5 the total charge on the revenue of India for meeting its obligations in London was a charge amounting to 8 per cent. of the total net revenue of the country, the amount being Rx.3,535,900. Last year that amount rose to Rx.14,751,600. The revenue has largely increased in the interval, but the increased number of rupees which the Indian Government have to remit to meet their obligations absorbs 27 per cent. of the total net Imperial revenue. (Hear, hear.) The net exports of merchandise in 1884-5 amounted to Rx.27,552,200; in 1894-5 they were Rx.35,412,600. Therefore, there is only an increase in value of net exports of eight million tens of rupees during that period, while the charge for exchange on the Indian Government has increased by upwards of 11 millions. But if it be such a benefit to India, this constant fall in the price of silver, why have all these Committees been appointed to investigate the subject? Why have all these remedies been suggested? A very important Committee sat two or three years ago, and the adoption of their main proposal caused a divergence between the exchange value of the rupee and the current price of silver. Undoubtedly their plan succeeded. From the moment the mints were closed the exchange value of the rupee has separated itself from the current price of silver, the difference at the present time being something like 2d. per rupee. At the same time I cannot quite admit that this is entirely satisfactory, because it must be remembered that by closing the mints in India you diminish the price of silver all over the world. After all, this propsal is at best a makeshift. Simultaneously with the closing of the mints in India certain movements of treasure have taken place which are worthy of notice. The net imports of treasure into India in the year before the mints were closed amounted to Rx. 10,051,000. The amount of silver coined at Calcutta and Bombay in that year was Rx. 12,612,000. In the middle of the next year the mints were closed, but the import of treasure had not then ceased, and it amounted to Rx. 14,361,064, while the amount of silver coined in Calcutta and Bombay was Rx. 4,902,000. In 1894-5 the mints altogether ceased to coin, and for the first time there is a great falling-off in the import of treasure, which only amounts to Rx. 1,355,000. Simultaneously with this there is a movement which shows that more rupees are coming into circulation. There is a curious institution called the rupee census, a subject to which Mr. Harrison has paid special attention, and he came to the conclusion last year that there had been a smaller return of old rupees into circulation than was supposed; but this year there is evidence of a distinct expansion of the circulation of old rupees, and he estimates this at about three crores. Assuming that to be correct, of course its effect on the currency is the same as if the mints during this year had coined that amount. The average coinage of the mints has ranged from 3½ to 13 crores of rupees, the average being 8¼ crores. I have now finished the part of my statement which relates to exchange. I have not ventured to enter into the controversial matter which this subject is calculated to provoke, but I think hon. members will feel that we ought not to be satisfied with the present position of affairs, and that we cannot look upon any policy which is a mere makeshift as a permanent and satisfactory one. There is one branch of Indian finance to which I think sufficient attention in previous statements has not been directed, and to which I believe my right hon. friend opposite (Sir H. Fowler) intended to devote a large portion of his speech, had he remained in office, and that is provincial finance. Now provincial finance does not correspond to anything known in this country as local finance. The Indian may, from this point of view, be described as a federal system, which does not correspond to the financial constitution of this country. Up to 1871 it was the custom for all the Imperial revenue collected to be paid into a central fund, and the local governments drew on that fund for their administrative wants. This arrangement was very unsatisfactory, because the object of every provincial government was to get as much as possible out of the central fund, and the object of the central Government was to try and check these demands. Lord Mayo, in 1870, acting on the advice of Sir John Strachey, issued a minute, by which he largely decentralised this system, giving to the Provincial Governments a fixed grant, with power to apply it as they wished to the various administrative services. He he handed over to them gaols, registration, police, education, medical services, printing, roads, miscellaneous public improvements, and civil buildings. The experiment answered admirably. In 1877-8 Sir John Strachey was Finance Minister. He was face to face with a very heavy deficit. There had been a series of bad years; the revenue was largely contracted and the expenditure augmented, and he had to suggest ways and means by which to meet the financial embarrassment. He made a very elaborate budget, which was much discussed at the time, and was hotly contested in this House. His proposal was further to develop decentralisation. and give to the various Governments the management of, and responsibility for land revenue, excise, stamps, general administration, and law and justice. He also gave them a further interest in connection with the disbursement of certain revenues, and made up a scheme by which the surplus or deficit over certain specified amounts should be divided between the Provincial Governments and the Imperial Government. In addition, he gave them control over public works and the revenue in connection with canals. This system was further developed in 1882-3. I attach very great importance to this work of decentralisation. I believe it is capable of almost indefinite expansion, and in course of time may solve some of the problems connected with the extension of local government in India. (Hear, hear). I may just mention one incident connected with it which personally affected myself. The last occassion on which I had the honour of introducing the Indian budget was in 1877; and it had reference to these proposals of Sir John Strachey. At that time party feeling ran very high on the Eastern question, and it was announced that Mr. Fawcett would move a series of resolutions condemning the proposals wholesale. I was informed, too, that he had enlisted the services of no less a person than Mr. Gladstone, and I confess I contemplated with considerable alarm the idea of being demolished by that great financier, who had intimated his intention of taking part in the debate. But I was quite sure that the main proposals which underlay Sir John Strachey's budget would appeal to the financial conscience of Mr. Gladstone, and I felt that, if I could do anything like adequate justice to my case, I should be able to make some impression upon him. It has always seemed to me that the right method of meeting the risk of famine in these districts is not by irrigation, but by extending the railroads, and I believe that is the principle which the Indian Government have adopted. Various reports laid before the House show that there is a very wide scope for the employment of capital in India in almost every form of industrial undertaking, and railway extension is, in my judgment, an essential preliminary to the encouragement of such enterprises. Undoubtedly, the original guarantee system under which we began the construction of railways was an extravagant system. But if railways are to be promoted by private enterprise on the present basis of a rebate, the question at once arises of the proportion of through traffic receipts the new lines should have. That is a very complicated question. The Indian Government and the India Office in recent years tried to lay down principles by which there should be an equitable division of this through traffic between existing lines and new branch lines. The result is that the profits or dividends which a new railway under this system are likely to earn are very difficult, in the first instance, to ascertain; and it is still more difficult for the ordinary investor exactly to ascertain the return he will get upon his capital. My belief is that we shall have to go back to some limited form of guarantee, giving these enterprises an interest in developing the railroad which they manage. It seems to me that at the present moment what the investor and the money market like is the certainty of a small return with a prospective increment. If we work in that direction we shall be able to create a stock in which trustees can invest. I attach the greatest importance to the extension and development of railroads, and I know my predecessor did so, too. And certainly, so long as we have the evils of a falling exchange to contend with, the development of the railway system is the best antidote to that evil. I thank the Committee for the attention with which they have listened to my speech. (Hear, hear.) It is a good many years since I last had the honour of laying a statement of this kind before the House, but I am bound to say, having looked into the facts with a perfectly open mind, and having examined most of the statistics which in any way indicate moral or material progress, it seems to me that in the main India has greatly improved during this period of 18 years. We have certain difficulties to deal with; but, after all, the same old difficulties that existed many years back—falling exchange, increased military establishments, frontier complications, and the increasing desire amongst certain classes in India to participate in the government of their own country—still exist. These are difficulties which we have always had, and which, so far as I can see, we are likely to have for a long time to come—difficulties which do not lend themselves to any immediate or any final solution. But I am glad to say that we have during this period contrived to eliminate, to a large extent, from our difficulties the terrible old evil of famine. Whether that be due to the accident of a long series of beneficent harvests, or to the precautions which the Indian Government have taken, I cannot say. But certainly, in the last twelve years neither Indian revenue nor Indian expenditure has largely suffered from famine. But there is always one difficulty—a difficulty quite as great and even more subtle than any I have enumerated—which always will attend Indian administration, and that is the attitude which any new House of Commons may assume upon Indian questions. The position of the Indian Government is truly anomalous. We have established at the other end of the world a great Government, and given it control over something like one-sixth of the human race. We have invested the head of that Government with all the pomp and paraphernalia of an omnipotent and of a final authority. Few monarchs have greater power, or are surrounded with greater pomp. And yet there is not a single detail in the administration of that continent, and not one iota of the policy of the Indian Government, which may not at any moment be called in question and reversed by an elective assembly sitting thousands of miles from the seat of action. The whole fabric of the Indian Government is based on an Act of Parliament. We wish to infuse into the Indian Government what we may call the elements of progress, of stability, and continuity, and yet we are forced by our political institutions to subject that Government to the wishes of any ephemeral majority that the electoral whim of the moment may create. These difficulties have been avoided in the past by the moderation and discretion with which this House individually and collectively has made use of this absolute power; and I have very much mistaken the character of this new House of Commons if I did not believe that the discretion will still continue. (Cheers.) We shall have to discuss some difficult Indian questions. Last night we discussed perhaps the thorniest and most difficult of all. and I noticed with great pleasure the moderation of the speeches and the discretion which every one, no matter from which side he spoke, exercised in the debate. I am confident that the fact that India is not represented will not operate to her disadvantage in this House. The very knowledge that she is so unrepresented will give her a moral claim on the mind of everybody who may speak on Indian questions. We can never forget that the strength of our rule in India consists in this—that we hold and govern India not for our own advantage, but for the benefit of the peoples of India. That consideration will, I am sure, be present to the mind of every member this House in every discussion in which he may take part and in every decision at which he may arrive in relation to India. (Cheers.)

Mr. JAMES KENYON said he was sure that in Lancashire the statement of the noble lord would be received with the greatest satisfaction, and would be regarded as a harbinger of better things for India. He congratulated the noble lord on having saved Rx. 500,000 by the reduction of interest, and he hoped further steps would be taken in the same direction. He, however, rose specially to point out that the figures given in relation to the cotton duties confirmed the view which Lancashire members had taken that, as at present levied these duties gave a most decided protection to India. He had had some experience of deputations to Secretaries for India. He remembered forming one of a deputation from Lancashire which waited upon Lord Kimberley in connection with the extension of railways in India. There was one remark made by Lord Kimberley on that occasion which was particularly impressed upon his mind. The House would probably remember that those import duties were placed on cotton goods about 20 years ago, and removed by a Conservative Government. The subject of the cotton duties was mentioned at this particular deputation, and Lord Kimberley then said that he viewed with horror the idea of replacing them. Before the duties were levied on the 1st of January last, the then Secretary of State for India (Sir Henry Fowler) was asked to receive a deputation upon the subject from the Lancashire master cotton spinners and the representatives of the operatives, but he replied that there was no necessity for receiving such a deputation. At that time, and, indeed, ever since, they in Lancashire thought that there was very great necessity indeed to receive a deputation, and he was extremely sorry that Sir H. Fowler did not allow them to see him and place these matters fairly before him. When he told hon. members that the decrease in the shipments of cotton cloth to India during the first six months of this year amounted to over 300,000,000 yards, they would be able to form some idea of the extent of the business with India in which Lancashire was concerned.

Sir H. **Fowler**: As compared with what period?

Mr. **Kenyon**: As compared with the previous year.

Sir H. **Fowler**: How about 1893?

Mr. **Kenyon**: That was the year of the great cotton strike, and I do not think you can very well make any fair comparison with that year.

Sir H. **Fowler**: Then 1892?

Mr. **Kenyon** said he would give the right hon. gentleman another reason for taking 1894. In that year the price of cotton was lower than it had ever been in the memory of this generation, and that accounted in a great measure for the large shipments which were made to India and to other parts of the world. He himself had practical experience of this business. He was a small trader, but in his way he sent fair quantities of these goods to India, and in that year he took advantage of the low price of his raw material to ship as much as he could. He noticed that during last night's debate on these duties the right hon. gentleman the member for Wolverhampton shook his head whenever the idea of the Indian manufacturer being protected was mentioned. That was particularly the case, he thought, when the hon. member for Stockport (Mr. G. Whiteley) stated that the Indian manufacturer paid only upon 60 per cent. of the total value of the cloth. He could give the right hon. gentleman figures out of his own business. There was a cloth in which they did a large and regular business—a cloth which was well known in Calcutta, in Delhi, and Rangoon, and, in fact, all over India; and, if the House would bear with him, he would give the exact figures. The cost of the yarn in that cloth was 8s. 4½d.; the cost of the size was 3d.; the cost of weaving (that was for wages alone) was 2s. 6½d., and the other manufacturing expenses were 2s. 4d.; the cost of finishing was 2s. 3d., and cost of shipping was 1s. 2d. The total cost was therefore 16s. 11d. The duty on the cloth at 5 per cent. brought up the amount to 17s. 9d., or, with the exchange at 1s. 1¼d., for half pieces of 40 yards, 8 rupees. The same cloth made in India with the same weight of yarn would have to pay a duty on 9s. 7½d., so that while the Lancashire manufacturer was paying a duty on 16s. 4d., the Indian manufacturer would pay on 9s. 7½d. only. Therefore, the Indian manufacturer got a protective duty in this case of 6½d. a piece. Those were actual statistics taken from a business going on every month. He had himself paid £700 or £800 duty since the 1st of January last. Those were actual facts which were at the disposal either of the Secretary of State for India or of Sir H. Fowler. This was not a picked or an isolated case, and he thought it conclusively proved that the Indian manufacturer was protected, and very well protected. Then there was the matter of the coarse yarns. It was an unfortunate thing for them in Lancashire that those duties were put on on the 1st of January this year, when the price of cotton was lower than anyone could remember in the present generation, because at that time there might have been a fair competition with the Indian millowners on their own ground. He was sorry to say that their business in Lancashire was a declining business. It was not prospering or progressing in the way it ought to do, and he thought that in these circumstances they deserved fair and reasonable consideration at the hands of the Indian Government. Take, on the other hand, the Blue-book which had been published during the last two or three weeks, and which gave the amount of progress in India. From the statement in that Blue-book, they found that in 1888 there were 89 cotton mills in India, and that in 1894 this number had increased to 136. In six years, therefore, they had an increase of 47 mills, or fully 50 per cent. The number of spindles, too, had increased from 2,190,000 to 3,500,000, and the workpeople employed had increased from 72,000 to 130,000. The other day he read an account of one of the mills in India (it was true it was one of the largest concerns), in which they made the magnificent sum of £70,000 in 1894. Lancashire would be wild with delight if they could make a tenth part of that sum at the present time. Another proof of the prosperity of the cotton trade in India was furnished by the statement which had been published by the Joint Committee of the Manchester Association of Spinners and Manufacturers and the trades unions. In that statement they gave a list of 63 Indian cotton mills. They gave the price of the stock twelve months ago and the price of the mill stock now, and the increase in the value of the shares during the last twelve months amounted to a sum of £800,000. This was an enormous increase, and it showed, he thought, conclusively, that the Bombay millowners considered that they had a very good thing. He would like to say that he believed that the right hon. member for Wolverhampton was deceived in the matter of these duties. He thought that right hon. gentleman was led astray by the powerful Bombay Millowners' Association, who, he expected, were looking well after themselves, and by the representations which were made to him from other quarters. In these circumstances, he regretted very much that the right hon. gentleman did not see someone from Lancashire who could have laid a statement before him which might have induced him to change his mind. He had mentioned some facts with regard to the prosperity of India. He now wished to mention a fact as indicating the condition of the Oldham mills and the mills in Lancashire generally. He thought it was a well-known fact to those hon. members who took any interest in business matters, that the Oldham mills for ten years past had not paid 2¾ per cent. or more than 3 per cent., and it was a common saying in that part of the country that a man had much better put his money into the Post Office Savings Bank than invest it in the cotton trade. It was a miserable affair when a great trade like the cotton industry got into such a condition, and he appealed to the noble lord, especially after the encouraging statement he had presented to the House, to take into his serious consideration whether he could not abolish these duties entirely, and let them be as they had been for the last twenty years, a Free Trade country, and able to compete fairly with India without being handicapped by these duties. When he heard the noble lord speak of the surplus, the thought occurred to him, why could not the Indian Government have done without the cotton duties altogether? They hoped they would not have a Chitral every year, and perhaps the noble Lord, when he had paid off his Chitral Bills, would be able to abolish these duties. He certainly hoped he would. He appealed to the Secretary of State, not only on behalf of his own constituents, but on behalf of Lancashire generally, to remove this burden and this obstacle to free trade. They were all free traders in Lancashire, and they wanted free trade carried out in India. They did not want Lancashire to be favoured. All they wanted was to be put on the same level with their Indian competitors, and if the Secretary of State could not see his way to abolish these duties altogether, he hoped the whole law would, at any rate, put the two countries on exactly the same footing. They wished all success to India, but at the same time they wanted to be treated with justice, and he hoped the noble lord would see to this as quickly as he possibly could. The Secretary of State had spoken of the desirability of developing the country with railways. He hoped that would be done, but perhaps he might be allowed to say that in India they did not know how to make railways at a proper speed. The noble lord had said with a feeling of pride, that there were now 18,000 miles of railways in India, but if a nation on the other side of the Atlantic had had to deal with India for the last 50 years they would have had, not 18,000, but 180,000 miles of railways. The policy enunciated by the Secretary of State for the Colonies would be most welcome news to every business man in the House. The right hon. gentleman had spoken of the family funds being used for the development of the family estates, and he sincerely trusted that that idea would not stop at the door of the Colonial office, but would go on to the India office. He trusted the noble lord would take advantage of the present state of the money market, when there was a complete glut of money and when investors were begging to have their money invested in some safe thing, to borrow money at an almost nominal rate for the purpose of developing the railway system in India. He was sure he was echoing the feelings of every Lancashire member when he wished every prosperity to India and every success to the noble lord who now filled the position of Secretary of State. (Cheers).

Sir **HENRY FOWLER**: I wish to make only two or three remarks arising out of the lucid statement the noble Lord has made. I congratulate him on his return, after an interval of 20 years, to his own sphere of duty at the India Office, and on his presenting the financial statement to the House as Secretary of State. (Hear, hear.) I think the clearness and statesmanlike manner of his exposition will commend itself to the consideration of the House. (Hear, hear.) There are one or two questions on which I should like to say a word or two, and the first is the question of the exchange. I think the figures the noble Lord gave cannot be challenged. I agree with him that the real financial difficulty at the present time is the enormous increase in the burden arising from exchange. I am glad to see that during the currency of the financial year that burden does not appear to have been so heavy as I anticipated at the time I made my last financial statement. The price that the Secretary of State has been receiving for his bills during the last three months is a very encouraging sign. A matter about which I was very much exercised when I was in office was the mode in which these bills are sold. I was not satisfied that the Indian Government got the full market price for what they had to sell. The Secretary of State is the only seller of the commodity, and there is only a limited number of buyers; and, whether right or wrong, I arrived at the conclusion that the buyers had a good deal to do with fixing the price which was offered. Had I been in office I should have devoted a considerable amount of further attention to the question, with a view to ascertaining whether some better mode of selling bills could not be devised. I know that the question is beset with difficulties, and possibly in the first instance it may be advisable to appoint a Departmental Committee to consider the question. Then, with reference to the debt, the noble Lord was quite accurate in what he said, and I will only make one addition to that. He alluded to the increase in the debt borrowed, during the last few years, for the purpose of meeting the deficits in expenditure, and I think he said it amounted to something like £9,000,000; but he will recollect that there was a large increase in the balance in the Indian Treasury which, of course, was not remitted; and, therefore, although the increase in the debt was a very large sum, against that must be set off the money not remitted. Then the noble Lord made some very just remarks with reference to the salt tax. I would commend to the hon. member who has just sat down what the noble Lord said on that question. I venture to predict this—that, whoever sits on that side of the Table, and whoever is responsible for the finances of India, and from whatever party he is drawn, whenever the time comes when he may be in the happy position of possessing such a surplus as may enable him to propose a reduction in the burdens of the people of India, the very first burden he will have to consider, with a view to its reduction, will be the salt tax—(hear, hear)—which is such a heavy burden on the population of India, and produces at the present time a revenue of £8,000,000. Then I also agree with what the noble Lord said with reference to railways. My desire was in every way to encourage the promotion and construction of railways, and I think that the noble Lord is on the right lines with reference to the necessity for small guarantees. I certainly think we ought to increase our State enterprises, and even to encourage private enterprise to come into the market. The railways in India form a part of the Public Works Department, and there is a member of Council set apart to attend to public works, but he changes every five years. The consequence is that so soon as a great Indian administrator has thoroughly mastered the principles of railway policy in India, he ceases to hold office and a new man has to begin again. I was myself of opinion that it would be very desirable to have a change in that Department, and it appeared to me that what was wanted in India was a general railway manager, someone not unlike the managers of our own great railway companies, a man perfectly familiar with all the details not only of railway finance, but of railway management; and I think it is well worth the consideration of the India Office whether it would not be wise to endeavour to make some change in that Department in the way of having an officer set apart to superintend railway matters. I was very glad to hear the noble lord's remarks with regard to Provincial finance. A great deal of the additional expenditure in India arises in that Department, and where outlay is sometimes complained of, I do not say unjustly, but, perhaps, not with perfect accuracy, a great deal of that outlay is made by Provincial Governments. With reference to home charges, a Commission is now sitting to investigate that matter, and I would venture to express the hope that the result of that enquiry may be to diminish the heavy pressure of Home Charges on Indian finance and to carry out the opinion already expressed by former Secretaries of State, like the Duke of Argyll, as well as by former Viceroys, as to the excessive nature of the demands made on the Indian Exchequer with reference to Home Charges. The noble lord paid a very just tribute of respect to the eminent services of Sir John Strachey. (Hear, hear.) When I tell the House that he went out to India as an East India cadet something more than half a century ago, that he has filled nearly every office in the Civil Service, rising from the lowest to the very highest, having at one time been acting Viceroy, that in every Department he has carried on affairs with the greatest ability, that the financiers of India are greatly indebted to him, and that everybody who is interested in India is also much indebted to him for his charming book on India, I think everybody will agree in the tribute the noble lord has very properly paid to that eminent servant of the Crown. (Hear, hear.) It may be said that I take an ignorant, optimistic view of the finances of India, but I am glad to find that my view has the high sanction of the noble lord, who has returned to the India Office after an interval of 20 years. He had acquaintance with Indian finance in 1874-80, he finds what it is to-day, and I am glad to find that, from his long experience, he is able in the House of Commons to endorse the views expressed by myself 12 months ago. Whatever our opinion may be as to whether India is economically or extravagantly governed, I hope there will always be, as there always has been in this House, a determination on Indian questions to make the interests of India supreme. (Hear, hear.) On no other grounds can we hold that Empire. I do not believe that any House of Commons which fairly represents the opinion of the English people will depart from that principle, or will refuse to render support to the Government of India when they believe that they are carrying out their difficult and onerous duties loyally, with a due regard to those matters in which the interests of the people of India can be separated from the interests of the people of this country. (Hear, hear.)

SIR W. WEDDERBURN'S AMENDMENT.

THE ACCOUNTS "INACCURATE AND MISLEADING."

Sir W. **WEDDERBURN** said no doubt by Act of Parliament it was required that a financial statement should be placed on the Table by the middle of May, but the fact was that was never done. He did not complain on that account of the present Government. He had rather to thank the Leader of the House for not attempting to take the Budget last night. He was glad to hear some of the sentiments expressed by the noble Lord. He stated that his principle was that India should be administered for the benefit of India. The noble Lord also stated that he should hold the balance steadily and firmly as between all contending interests. The holding the balance firmly was a very difficult thing indeed, and the noble Lord would need all his determination to do so, because they must remember that there were two very antagonistic views on Indian subjects. On the one hand there was the European official view of all questions, and on the other hand there was the general public opinion of the Indian people. On the official side there was all that power to which the noble Lord referred. They were always in power; they had complete authority over every question. What was the position of the people of India? They had been referred to as being dumb, and it was very difficult to have their views placed before the country. One of the complaints made by those who criticised the Indian Government was that far too much of the revenue was spent on military purposes. One reason for this was that the military element was too strongly repres on the Council of the Viceroy. They did not money was wrongly spent, but they said that the whole standard of expenditure in India was more than the country could afford. The noble lord, the Secretary of State for India, attributed our financial difficulties to loss on exchange; but that was not the principal cause of the present difficulty. They said that the military policy was the principal cause of it. The Government claimed that they had no control over loss by exchange, but that was only true as regards the automatic increase. In the last seven years the increase in civil and military expenditure had been Rx.5,429,000, and the increased loss by exchange on this amount was Rx.848,000. This was within the control of the Government, and amounted to a total of Rx.6,277,000 against Rx.4,195,000, the automatic loss by exchange. The total increase in unreproductive military and civil expenditure with attendant exchange was thus about Rx.10,500,000, and this had swallowed up Rx.5,000,000 the increase in revenue, Rx.2,500,000 economics in other departments, and Rx.3,000,000 new taxation. The increase in revenue was Rx.5,000,000, and that was not obtained without inflicting great hardship upon the people. I meant a further turning of the screw, a more rigid and severe collection of the revenue. Something had been said about the pressure on the people of the salt tax. Any severity in the collection of the tax would add much hardship. Then there was the increase in the land revenue. Complaints were made as to the excessive enhancement of the revenue. The rent of small holdings had been raised to an enormous extent, as much as tenfold at one stroke. That had been done all over the country, and it was producing a feeling of dissatisfaction and unrest which was of the most dangerous kind. He hoped this matter would receive very careful attention. A hearing should be given to the complaints that were being made, and the mere assurance of local officials should not satisfy the Secretary of State. Three millions more had been raised by the new taxation. hon. members from Lancashire should clearly understand that the extra three millions which had been obtained by the import duties had directly been raised in order to fill up this vacuum of three millions for the increase of civil and military expenditure. The figures given above were the official figures, only brought to account in a somewhat different manner. He considered the mode followed by the Government of India, especially as regards loss by exchange, and computation of the public debt, to be inaccurate and misleading, and he had put down an amendment to that effect. The particulars he had set forth in a printed memorandum which he had circulated to the noble lord and to members of the House. It was very difficult to understand these accounts at the very best, and the question of the debt which was raised in his proposed Amendment was very important indeed. It required a very expert knowledge properly to allocate different amounts between three different headings. An item of expenditure might either be put down as current expenditure, it might find its way into ordinary debt, or it might be put aside as a debt on capital account, invested in public works of a reproductive kind. Very great care should be exercised as regards the allocation of any item, and any confusion that might arise amongst these three headings might lead to considerable misunderstanding. The particular item to which he had addressed his Amendment on the Paper would be found at page 82 of the financial statement. In column three of that statement would be found the permanent debt incurred during the year 1893-4. It would there be seen that there was the figure 4,043,311, but nothing was stated as to what that figure was, whether tens of rupees or pounds sterling. He asked the noble Lord what that figure was, because it would be found that that amount had been made up out of several different items. In these financial statements the debt of India was shown under two forms; the debt in India, which was shown in tens of rupees, and the debt in England, which was shown in pounds sterling. The new debt incurred in India during the year 1893-4 was set down at Rx. 3,719,000, and during that year Rx. 1,110,000 of debt was discharged, leaving the amount of nett debt incurred during that year at Rx.2,609,000. The new debt which India incurred in England during the year 1893-4 was set down at £2,686,000; during the year £1,251,000 of the debt was discharged, leaving the nett amount of debt incurred here £1,435,000. These two items together produced the figure of 4,043,000 to which he had referred. What was it? It was mixed pounds and tens of rupees; possibly a bi-metallic currency of a novel kind. (Laughter). He, therefore, asserted this item of 4,043,000 was inaccurate and misleading. The figure must be either pounds sterling or tens of rupees; if tens of rupees, then it was quite evident that something must be added in order to bring the £ sterling to the denomination of Rx. He had done that, and, putting the exchange according to what it stood at when the debt was incurred, instead of 4,043,000, it made Rx.4,950,000. On the other hand, if they were pounds sterling, the rupees must be reduced to that denomination, and then the item would be about £3,000,000. A very great discrepancy, therefore, arose. He believed that the intention of the financial statement was that to show the amount in tens of rupees; but, not only the public but the Indian Government itself, had been misled; and to prove this, he would refer to a statement at page 94 of the financial paper. The noble Lord would find, at page 95, this same item of 4,043,000, and it was there called tens of rupees. The reason why this matter was so important was because it affected the credit and position of the Indian Government whether an increase or a decrease was made in the ordinary debt or whether an increase or decrease was made on the reproductive capital. He would also point out to the noble Lord that, apparently, credit was taken in these accounts for this distinction, and he would refer to page 80, at the foot of which appeared an item termed expenditure not charged to revenue. The amount, the total of which purported to be expenditure upon reproductive public works, amounted to a total of 3,621,000. He presumed that it was intended to set that amount off against the debt of 4,043,000. But, if this were the case, it made a very great difference whether the amount were Rx.4,043,000, or Rx.4,950,000; and he would ask the noble Lord to state what had become of the difference. The same doctrine must, he contended, be applied to the whole debt, and as regards the last 10 years this error would create a difference of Rx.12,000,000. It was very desirable that the public should be encouraged to look into the question of Indian Accounts. They were like the shareholders in a big concern, and they were entitled to have the accounts so presented that they could understand the whole effect of them very easily. As to the Famine Fund, if the noble Lord would look again into its history he would find that special taxes were levied and allocated for the maintenance of the fund, and when Lord Lytton was questioned with respect to its permanence, he most indignantly repudiated the idea of its being touched. As to compensation to the Services for loss by exchange, the people of India were willing that those who served them should have fair and reasonable remuneration; but they complained of the indiscriminate nature of the compensation given. The man who entered the Service when the rupee was at 1s. 6d. was reasonably disappointed when it fell to 1s. 1d., but the man who entered the Service when the rupee was at the lower figure had no right to complain. The difficulties of the Government of India were not primarily due to the loss by exchange, but to extravagance, and the fall in exchange should have been foreseen and provided against from year to year. The Government of India had not any claim to treat the fall as a decree of Providence against which it was useless to contend. The fall in the rupee should be met by corresponding economies. The proportions of extra expenditure fairly debitable to loss on the exchange as compared with that debitable to increased civil and military expenditure was as two to three. A great additional expenditure would be involved by the maintenance of the road to Chitral, and there seemed every probability that some such item of expenditure would appear every year. In the 10 years before this "forward" military policy was undertaken—namely, 1874-84—the total expenditure on these small frontier wars was only Rx.161,000. In the next 10 years the expenditure had risen to Rx.4,925,877. That was about half-a-million of tens of rupees every year on frontier expeditions. The subsidies to border tribes were increasingly heavy. As to interfering with the Government of India, he hoped the noble lord would exercise his own judgment, and decide clearly on the merits of the case, and would not be too much swayed by men who pushed their opinions most honestly, but who were immensely prejudiced by their professional relations and desire for distinction. The accounts of the Indian Government were, on the whole, well kept, good accounts; but the policy of expenditure was what he complained about. The Indian Government should first find what revenue was available, and should then regulate the expenditure accordingly. With regard to railways, there was a general tendency to ask the right hon. gentleman to increase the expenditure on railways, and there again he hoped the noble lord would hold the balance firmly. There were many powerful interests in this country concerned in pushing the railways in India, such, for instance, as those who supplied the machinery, the rails and the stores. There was one direction in which large economies could be effected by the Government of India, without in the least degree affecting the efficiency of the administration, except, indeed, to improve it. He referred to the increasing employment of natives in the service of their own country. The natives were willing to accept smaller salaries than foreigners. It was, no doubt, true that there were certain appointments which must be held by Europeans in India, but he thought that the number might be limited. The proposal to decentralise and develope the system of provincial financial administration met with his most cordial approval, as he believed that that was a direction in which economy would be attained. It was quite evident that in a great country like India the form of taxation in one part was not suitable to another part. One of the most unfortunate results of the present financial difficulties was that the balances belonging to the different Provincial Governments had been swept into the Imperial Treasury. These balances represented the economy of the different provinces, and it was a great disaster to local progress and development that they should be spent upon frontier expeditions. He suggested that if the salary of the Secretary of State for India were placed upon the British Estimates it would bring the interest of the House of Commons to bear on the question of Indian expenditure. It was most important that the Secretary of State should know the opinion of the people of India, for whose interests, however, no member was responsible. He would ask the noble lord, therefore, to learn what the Indian opinion was, as he felt certain that the safety of the Empire would be better attained by increasing their contentment, and by lightening taxes, by giving money for purposes of education and sanitation, and the small improvements that the people required. The people of India had no wish that the Russians should come into India, and with a sympathetic administration the condition of the country would be enormously improved, and ultimately India might be made so prosperous that her trade with Great Britain would be larger than our trade with all the rest of the world. He concluded by moving, as an Amendment, to add at the end of the Question the words—"But it is to be regretted that these accounts are inaccurate and misleading as regards the net amount of public debt incurred."

Mr. T. R. Buchanan observed that his hon. friend the member for Banffshire had dealt at length with the various questions affecting India, and every one who knew the hon. member as he did, would know that his heart was entirely single in his desire to see the reforms he had advocated carried out. He should like to say a few words touching some of these reforms.

The Chairman (interposing) observed that the hon. member could not discuss the general question, but must confine his observations to the particular point dealt with by the amendment now before the Committee.

Mr. Buchanan: The hon. baronet, in his speech, was allowed to deal with a variety of other matters.

The Chairman: He made a speech dealing with a variety of other matters, but he concluded by moving an amendment; and that amendment having been put from the chair, the discussion must now be confined to the subject-matter of the amendment.

Mr. Buchanan replied that he had no observations to add on the specific subject dealt with by the amendment.

On the return of the Chairman, after the usual interval,

Lord George Hamilton, in reply to the question raised by the hon. member for Banffshire, said whether one agreed with the view of that hon. member or not, one could not doubt that in his conduct he was actuated by a sincere desire to improve the condition of the mass of the people of India. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member, in his speech, dealt with a number of topics, but he spent most of his time in discoursing on the way in which certain accounts were presented to Parliament. The hon. gentleman was a member of the Royal Commission on the administration of the expenditure of India, and he would suggest to him that the question of the necessity of altering the form of these accounts on the lines indicated by the hon. aronet was one which could be much better dealt with inside that Commission. The hon. member had raised various complicated questions, and it was almost impossible for anyone, even the highest-trained expert, to deal with the minute matters contained in an account covering a hundred pages. One of the difficulties about the Indian Government was that their revenues were in silver. They had a rupee revenue, and certain obligations in gold and certain in silver. When an obligation in gold was replaced or renewed by a similar obligation in gold there was no object in bringing in the exchange. But where a gold obligation was replaced by a silver obligation, then the exchange would come in, and *vice versâ*, if a silver obligation was replaced by a gold obligation then the question of exchange would again come in. This was the principle adopted in the accounts. He did not think it was possible in any particular form more accurately to convey the position of these obligations than in that adopted by the Indian Government. If any better plan could be formulated the hon. member could bring it forward in the Commission of which he was a member. He would now pass to the general questions which the hon. member had raised.

The Chairman observed that it would be out of order to discuss the general question until this particular amendment had been disposed of.

Sir W. Wedderburn intimated that after what the noble lord had said as to the form of the accounts he did not wish to press his amendment. It appeared to be a matter as to which there was some doubt, and he hoped the experts would look into it.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Buchanan agreed with the noble lord that the question of the form of accounts was a fit matter for the investigation of the Commission which had been referred to. He did not altogether agree with what had been said by the hon. member for Banffshire as to the functions of this House with regard to the control over the Government and administration of India. His own general opinion was that the less the House interfered with the details of the government of India the better. (Hear, hear.) He was sorry that the hon. member seemed rather to deprecate the great extension of railways in India, because he thoroughly believed there was no way in which they could better develop the resources of India and prevent the recurrence of famine than by an extension and improvement of the railway system. He wished to know from the Secretary for India whether, in view of the fact that Indian finance had turned out better than was expected, the military and other works which had been interrupted last year, in consequence of financial pressure, would now be proceeded with, and whether the provincial balances would not be drawn upon in future. He hoped that, with better financial prospects, those useful works would again be undertaken and carried through. As one who had no interest, commercial or political, in the question of the Indian cotton duties, he should like to say that there were hon. members like himself, and very many electors in the country, who looked upon these duties purely as a political question affecting the Government of India. These import duties, as they well knew, were imposed by the Government of India as a financial necessity; and as the only, or at all events the least burdensome, way out of their difficulties. The Government of India were unanimous on the subject. He was gratified to observe that the noble lord, in the Chitral debate, relied largely on the fact that the Government of India were unanimous in recommending the occupation of Chitral. And although he was expressing disagreement with the right hon. member for Wolverhampton and those who sat on his own side of the House, he was bound to say that he agreed with the noble lord rather than the right hon. member for Wolverhampton on that subject. He thought the rule laid down by the noble lord yesterday, in regard to frontier policy, should also be carefully observed in the matter of the import duties. He heard with some satisfaction the speech made by the noble lord last night, because it was useless to disguise the fact that his speech of last February made some, both here and in India, somewhat anxious as to the line the present Government might take upon this question. They were much reassured by the statement of the noble lord. They would view with very great jealousy indeed any evidence that the Secretary of State or the Home Government was putting any kind of pressure on the Government of India to adopt a line of policy, with regard to finance or any other matters, that was not wholly or principally actuated by the interests and the welfare of India, and that alone.

Mr. W. J. GALLOWAY, in rising to address the House for the first time, craved that generous indulgence which the House never refused to a new member. He desired to endorse what fell from the hon. member for Bury in the earlier part of the debate. He maintained that no adequate reason had been advanced for the imposition of the cotton duties. No necessity whatever had been made out for those duties being imposed. In his financial statement the noble lord told them that the total amount received from the Import Duties was Rx. 300,000, and that the amount received from Excise Duties was somewhere about Rx. 13,000. These figures demonstrated beyond all doubt that the duties had acted to the detriment of the manufacturers in this country, and to the advantage of the manufacturers in India. The late Secretary of State laid it down, in consenting to the imposition of the duties, that he should require that they should not be protective, and that an equivalent in Excise Duties should be imposed on all goods manufactured in India. He submitted that the figures adduced by the noble lord showed conclusively that promise of the right hon. gentleman had not been carried out, and he could only hope that in the course of the present year the noble lord would see his way to remove those duties, or at all events to remove the injustice from which Lancashire at the present moment suffered. In Lancashire it was believed that the difficulties in Indian Finance were due almost entirely to the fluctuations in exchange, but during the last twelve months the rate of exchange had been steadier than during the previous nine years. For his own part he believed they had touched the bottom in this matter, and that in future they would not see those violent fluctuations in the value of silver which had occurred during the last few years. All that Lancashire asked for was fair play. They asked that they should be treated in exactly the same way, neither better nor worse, than the Indian manufacturer, and he hoped the noble lord would see his way to doing something to alleviate the distress which existed in Lancashire owing to so many mills being closed. Referring to the visit of the Shahzada to this country, he asked the noble lord to state in next year's budget the cost of that visit under a separate head, instead of including it, as he was afraid was usually the case with such items, under the head of miscellaneous expenses.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend, who has made in very clear and forcible language his first contribution to our debates, is the last of many speakers who have risen to place the cause of Lancashire before the House and the country. I think it will be felt by all impartial auditors that, considering the condition of the cotton trade in Lancashire, considering the lively interest which is felt by their constituents in the condition of that trade, and considering how vitally is bound up with the prosperity of that trade, I was going to say the continuance of Lancashire as a great manufacturing centre, I think it will be felt by every impartial auditor that these gentlemen have not approached this question with heat, but have endeavoured to discuss it with temperance, and have shown an appreciation of the difficulties of India, as well as of the position of Lancashire. It appears to me that the general principles which ought to animate the Government of this country and the Government of India in matters of this kind are not very difficult to arrive at. The difficulty is not in determining what the principles should be, but how those principles should be applied; and I think it a most extraordinary statement to assert, as the hon. member for Aberdeenshire asserted, that the Government of India are never to have any regard whatever for the interests of members of the same Empire living outside the borders of that Empire. I do not hold that view. I believe the British Empire is one great organisation existing for the benefit of its members in whatever part of the world they may live: and it appears to me to be as extreme and untrue a statement to say that the Indian Government is never to have regard to the interests of England as to say that the English Government is never to have regard to the interests of India. It is evident that both the Government of India and the Government of England are bound to consider, not merely their own interests, but the interests of the vast Empire of which they are both members. But though I think that correction of the hon. member's statement is a necessary correction—though I think it ought to be made, and that it is merely a false sentimentality which prevents its being made and recognised—I do also think that the great and overwhelming power possessed by this House, and the fact that this House is constituted of men who directly represent, not India, but constituencies in this country, should make us, and ought to make us, and I hope always will make us, particularly anxious in dealing with these questions that we do not allow the special interests of our constituencies to override the broader interests of the Empire; and I do not think there is any set of men more anxious, even under difficult circumstances, to recognise that principle than the members for Lancashire. While those are the general principles that ought to animate us, you are liable to enter into the region of controversial detail when you come to their application; and yet, on this particular occasion, it seems to me that there is less controversy than might be supposed between the two sides of the House. I cannot make out that the right hon. gentleman the late Secretary of State for India differs in any important particular either from my noble friend or from the other gentlemen who sit on this side of the House. He found it necessary to impose a customs duty in India. He stated, in terms as explicit as terms could be, that that customs duty was not an excuse for a protective duty, and was not to be made an excuse for a protective duty. He laid it down in language quite unmistakable in its import that, if the customs duty should have a protective character, then the general system of taxation must be so modified by putting on a countervailing excise duty that that protective character must be wholly eliminated. That gives that fair play to Lancashire which Lancashire asks for—(cheers)—and I think that both the country at large and Lancashire in particular may trust my noble friend to carry out a policy, which is not his only, as distinguished from the policy of the right hon. gentleman opposite, but is a policy which has been declared and accepted by both parties alike in this House and in this country. (Hear, hear.) I go further, and say that I confidently expect that in that policy, in which both parties in this country are agreed, they will find a cordial co-operation from the Government of India, who have to work out the details so many miles away. (Cheers). I do not wish to enter into the very difficult and complicated controversy, on which I hold a very strong opinion, but which is only indirectly bound up with this subject. But I am obliged—after what fell from the hon. Member for Aberdeenshire, who laid it down as a principle never to be departed from, that the Indian Government are to be allowed an absolutely free hand to manage their own financial operations—to remind him that the Indian Government have over and over again implored to be allowed to modify their currency system in the direction of a bimetallic ratio, and have never been allowed to do so by the Government of this country. That may be right or it may be wrong, but it shows that the financial freedom for which the hon. gentleman pleads has never yet been granted to the Government of India. I hope that the time may come when these import duties may be done away with; when the financial position of India will render such a step possible, as it is desirable, both in the interest of the Indian consumer and the Lancashire producer. I do not know that we can look forward to that time until probably there is some reversion to the relations between the value of the Indian rupee and the British sovereign, and I should greatly fear that, until something in the direction of currency reform can be accomplished, we shall find it very difficult in India to do something in the direction of these customs duties. Till that day comes, as I earnestly hope it may, we shall have to content ourselves with insisting that such customs duties as have to be imposed shall not be allowed to carry with them as an indirect consequence undue or exceptional favour to the Indian manufacturer. (Hear, hear).

Mr. B. L. COHEN joined in congratulating the noble lord on the interesting statement he had made. He would only say, in comment on the observations of the hon. member for Banffshire, that he had been answered by anticipation by the noble lord, who pointed out that while the expenditure in this country had increased during the last decade by £9,500,000, in India it would positively have decreased had it not been for the operation of the exchange for which the Indian Government could not be held responsible. That gratifying comparison was an evidence not only of the admirable organisation throughout the whole Indian Empire, but also that these military operations had never been undertaken without good reason being established in the minds of those responsible for

078219

the government of India, and without careful economy in their management. He passed to the first of the subjects to which he desired to draw attention, namely, what the late Secretary of State referred to as the unsatisfactory way in which the Indian Council sold its drafts. The right hon. gentleman told the committee that it had been his intention to alter the present system, and he felt convinced that the noble lord would carry out that intention. He had no experience or knowledge of the arrangements in operation for the sale or purchase of Indian Council drafts, but he could speak with considerable experience of the combinations which had been made in the case of Colonial stock which had been offered for tender at the Bank of England. He was not prepared with any specific scheme whereby the India office could make sure of securing the best prices, but he thought that the Department would do well to bring their arrangements more into harmony with the arrangements which would be made by any ordinary banking firm having to draw upon their correspondents. The noble lord, in his opinion, had resolved upon the right method of dealing with the Indian railway guarantees. The system under which the guarantees were given in old and recent times did not appeal to the common sense of a business man. He supposed, when a guarantee of 5 per cent. was given, it was found that the capital could not be raised unless that interest was given, but such a sum was more than sufficient return to investors who had in addition a reversionary interest in any future prosperity of the undertakings. He hoped, if the shareholder was to have a reversionary interest in the success of an undertaking in the future, as he thought he ought, that the guarantee would be so reduced as not to give more than a sufficient return to the investor. If it was decided that there was to be no reversionary interest, then, and then only, should the guarantee be for the whole amount which was found to be necessary for the creation of the capital. There was a much bigger problem than this to which he hoped that the noble lord's attention would be given during the recess. He referred to the conditions under which capital was raised with the guarantee of the Secretary of State in Council. Had not the time arrived when such capital ought to be created with the Imperial guarantee in lieu of the guarantee of the Indian Government? It was difficult to compute what would have been the difference to the Indian Exchequer if all the capital raised during the last fifty years with the guarantee of the Secretary of State had been raised with the guarantee of the Imperial Exchequer. It was not easy to make the computation, and it was, of course, impossible to alter what had taken place. But he should like to explain how matters stood now. The Indian Government debt in this country at present was about 121 millions sterling, including the 13 millions issued for redeeming annuities. The capital of the Indian railways amounted in ordinary stock to about 61 millions, and in debenture stock to over 12 millions. To this there had to be added annuities of £1,135,000 a year, which he capitalised at between 35 and 40 millions. Thus, altogether, they were dealing with a debt of £229,000,000. If this money had been secured under an Imperial guarantee, the amount payable by India in interest would have been enormously reduced. The difference between the credit of the Indian Government and the British Government was smaller now than when that capital was created, so if the Government were to adopt his view the gain to the Indian Exchequer would now be less than it would have been if the change had been effected in past times. To the Imperial Exchequer the change would not cause a difference of a shilling. It was time that the fiction of the difference between the guarantee of the Indian Exchequer and the guarantee of the Imperial Exchequer should cease. Indian 3 per cent. stock now stood at about 109, and British $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. stock was at 106. Why should not the Indian Government have the advantage of the superiority of credit—in his judgment unmerited superiority—which attached to an Imperial guarantee. It would probably be said by some hon. members that the British Exchequer was not responsible for the financial obligations of India No doubt it was not responsible legally, but the risk of guaranteeing this debtor could not be considered seriously—certainly the risk was not regarded seriously in the City. Moreover, although the Imperial Exchequer was not legally responsible for the debt of India, there was no one in that House or outside of it, who fancied that the British Treasury would not come in aid of the Indian Exchequer, were it possible to suppose India in default. Indian Government stock was at this moment a Parliamentary security in which trustees could invest. Possibly it might be urged against him that this course would be a precedent which the colonies would wish to take advantage of. He answered that objection by saying that there was not one single respect in which the debt of India and colonial debts were identical or even similar. Whilst our colonies were self-governed, India could not do a single thing without the sanction of the Secretary of State in Council and of that House. Indian Government stock was, therefore, subject to Parliamentary control, and he held that it was the duty of this country to act in aid of the Indian Exchequer in respect of the large creations of debt which would have to be made and were being made every year by means of debentures which had to be renewed, and for other fresh capital that had to be raised. This would not impose on the Imperial Exchequer one farthing of pecuniary liability, and would enormously and for ever reduce the burdens on the Indian Exchequer.

Mr. W. E. M. Tomlinson said that the Committee of Lancashire manufacturers had hoped for a slightly more sympathetic statement than they had received. No doubt it was the intention of the noble lord to see that absolute fairness was observed in the matter of the countervailing duties, but he wished him to understand that, from the point of view of the Lancashire manufacturers, no attempt to remedy the protective effect of the import duties by an Excise duty would do. Lancashire would never be satisfied until the remission of these duties was brought about altogether. Although he quite agreed that the remission of the Salt Tax was a desirable thing, he hoped that the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman, the late Secretary of State, that it should have precedence would not find favour. He would ask his right hon. friend to give an assurance that the Lancashire Committee should have a full opportunity of considering the reply which he received from the Government of India to their memorial.

Lord George Hamilton thanked the right hon. gentleman opposite for the kind way in which he had spoken of his statement, and assured him that the various suggestions he had made should have his careful attention. With regard to the suggestion that some improvement in the method of selling Indian Bills should be effected, he believed it was possible to introduce some improvements, but it was a difficult question. As to the visit of the Shahzada, the expenses would be brought into the accounts of the present year. He did not think the amount would be as large as the original estimate, and it was only right to say that every private entertainment given by the Shahzada would be paid out of his own private purse. With regard to what had been said by the hon. member for Banffshire, he was quite prepared to consider any reasonable proposition the hon. gentleman might put before him in reference to the Government of India; but what he wished to point out was that, if the hon. gentleman wished to call attention to any defect in the administration in India, it would be better for him to confine himself to one particular point, and not to indulge in a general diatribe against the whole administration of that country. He agreed with the hon. gentleman that the utmost consideration should be paid to the wishes of the people of India, but when the hon. gentleman got up and said he wished to speak on behalf of the people of India, he demurred altogether to that phraseology. He did not in the least dispute the excellent motives of the particular body of which the hon. gentleman was one of the representatives, but he denied altogether that the body represented the great mass of the people of India. (Hear, hear.) As to the suggestion of his hon. friend behind him that there should be an Imperial guarantee of the Indian debt, that was not a new proposal. It was made many years ago, but there seemed to him to be an absolutely insuperable objection to any general guarantee of that kind. The Indian Government ought to have as much independence as it was possible to give them. Could that independence be secured if behind that Government there was an Imperial guarantee? (Hear, hear.) If such a condition of things existed and the country possessed a Commander-in-Chief who desired to embark in large military operations, what a splendid opportunity he would have of doing so with an Imperial guarantee at his back. These were not the only objections. If there was an imperial guarantee attached to the debt of India, that very fact would give every member of the House of Commons an inherent and almost necessary right to interfere with the Indian Government in such a way as would make it absolutely impossible to work the machine. His belief was that it was far better to keep the debt separate. It might be now and then desirable for the House to assist the Indian revenue, as had been done before, but in that case let it be done by a money grant. Unless the two accounts were kept separate it would be almost impossible to impress on the Indian Government that sense of responsibility for the administration of their own affairs which was so desirable. (Hear, hear.) He thanked the Committee for the kind manner in which they had received his statement, and he was glad to find that on the great mass of Indian questions there was not a very wide difference of opinion between members in different parts of the House: and he would do his best during his tenure of office to try and maintain that kindly and cordial feeling which had characterised the debate. (Cheers.)

Mr. TOMLINSON said the noble lord had not answered his question.

Lord G. HAMILTON said the memorial referred to had gone out to India, but the dispatch to be sent with it would not go for a day or two. A deputation from Lancashire sought to see him some time back, and he told them that there would be no advantage in seeing them at that particular time. He told them, however, that if they wished to discuss the matter some months later he should be glad to meet them. To that promise he still adhered, and that would answer the hon. member's question.

The Resolution was then agreed to, and the House resumed.

Compiled
1999-2000